

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXI.]

MARCH, 1854.

[VOL. X.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM TURNER, JUN., M.A.

THE friends and pupils of Mr. TURNER who assembled a few months since at York, felt that the testimonial then offered to him was a late acknowledgment of their obligations; but they little thought that, had it been deferred only a short time, he would have been placed beyond the reach of all expressions of gratitude and affection. It was a startling annunciation to them, that he who had presided over their festive meeting with so much hearty cheerfulness, and had taken leave of them with the expression of his hope before long to meet them again, had been called away from life with such an abrupt summons. And now the removal of Mr. Turner, not indeed without warning, yet with so short an interval between apparent health and fatal disease, has cast a deeper gloom over the otherwise pleasant recollections of that time. The friends of Manchester College, in which he filled so important an office,—his pupils,—the Unitarian body in general, to which he had rendered eminent service,—and the readers of the Christian Reformer, which had been often enriched by his communications,—will naturally expect that some record of his life and some estimate of his character should appear in these pages. Indeed, were it not for the existence of the Reformer, we know not where any memorial could appear of the virtues and talents of those whom death so rapidly removes from amongst us. The miscellaneous contents of a weekly journal are not well fitted to receive, nor its fugitive leaves to preserve, such tributes; and we may be assured that no publication proceeding from those who are hostile, or even indifferent, to our religious opinions, would allow us to express our feelings respecting eminent members of our body.

WILLIAM TURNER was born, January 13, 1788, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where his father had been settled, six years before, as minister of the Hanover-Square congregation. The name of this venerable man, now in his 93rd year, cannot be mentioned without deep sympathy for the fresh bereavement which has befallen him in the death of his last surviving son. We know, however, that he lives, not like the Roman rhetorician, “*ut incuset deos, superstes suorum*,”—nor like the patriarch, “*refusing to be comforted*,”—but in the calm and cheerful resignation of

Christian piety and hope. He had married the sister of the Rev. John Holland, of Bolton; but as she died while his children were young, their education devolved on his second wife, the daughter of the Rev. William Willets, of Newcastle-under-Lyne, a woman of great energy and worth of character, whose affectionate and faithful discharge of the duties which she assumed towards Mr. Turner's family, has been gratefully acknowledged by them.* William Turner appears to have been placed at school, first with Mr. Prowitt, of Newcastle; afterwards with his maternal uncle at Bolton; and finally, under his father. Among his school-fellows in his father's house was his cousin, the present Sir Henry Holland; and their early association produced a friendship, of which the memorials remain in a correspondence continued through many years, till their divergent course of life and the increasing occupations of both brought it to a close, without any diminution of the affection in which it had begun. From his father's house he removed, in the autumn of 1803, as an exhibitor on Dr. Williams's foundation, to the University of Glasgow, and having completed the necessary term of three sessions, graduated M.A. in 1806. He had distinguished himself in his various classes; but in those days there was no competition for University honours, the degree being conferred on all who could pass through a very superficial examination. The University contained at that time a mixture, in nearly equal proportions, of men of talents and mediocrity. Richardson, the Professor of Humanity, was an elegant but feeble scholar. Young, full of energy and fire, excited the enthusiasm of his students, and opened to them those principles of Philosophical Grammar which were then so far from entering into school education in England, that they were not even heard of in our Universities. Jardine, though not profound in the philosophy of Literature and Taste, and scarcely touching on the subject of Logic, which from the title of his office seemed his chief province, was an admirable trainer of the youthful mind in habits of orderly thinking and correct expression. On the other hand, Millar, the Professor of Mathematics, had been chosen to his office from the influence of his father, the eminent jurist, with little qualification as a man of science and no aptitude as a teacher. Meikleham, in the department of Natural Philosophy, possessed respectable attainments, but was content to go on from year to year without any attempt to raise the standard of acquirement, or keep pace with the progress of science. Mr. Turner's tastes and previous pursuits inclined him more to Mathematics and Natural Philosophy than to Philology, and he must deeply have felt the weakness of these two departments of the College instruction. In Professor

* See a brief, but very expressive notice, probably from the pen of William Turner, in the C. R., N. S., I. 126.

Mylne, on the contrary, he found a teacher of Mental and Moral Philosophy who exercised a great influence over his mind, and led him to the cultivation of those branches of knowledge in which he afterwards most excelled. Candid and undogmatical himself, and sufficiently liberal to be an object of great suspicion to the bigoted religious party, Mylne laid down no system to be demonstrated, but in clear, simple and impartial summaries, brought the chief systems of metaphysical and ethical writers before his class. The prominence which he gave to the opinions of his eminent predecessor, Dr. Reid, though no blind follower of his doctrines, was very useful to his pupils from England, who, at least if familiar with the writings of Dr. Priestley, were apt to confound Reid in one sentence of contemptuous condemnation with Beattie and Oswald. Mr. Turner always spoke with approval of this mode of lecturing, and was probably influenced by his recollections of it when he became himself a teacher of the same branches of knowledge. Among his associates in his academical course at Glasgow, were several young men of the Independent denomination, H. F. Burder, Payne and Fletcher, all of whom have since become eminent in their own religious connection.

In the year 1806, Mr. Turner removed to York, as a divinity student in the College lately established there under the superintendence of the Rev. C. Wellbeloved, with whom he went through the two years' course of theological study then prescribed by the rules of that institution. The best proof of the diligence with which he availed himself of the advantages afforded him by the instructions of his learned and candid teacher, is to be found in the judicious application of scriptural criticism which characterizes his theological writings, his clear conception and forcible statement of the evidences of revelation, and his deep reverence for the sacred writings. He was fortunate in having for his contemporaries, among a small number of students, some of superior abilities and worth,—Hunter, Madge, Robberds, Astley and Dean; Sydney Shore, Marsland, Godman and Darbishire; with several of whom he lived in a friendship which lasted to the end of life. Before the close of his second session, he had received an invitation to preach at Chester, with a view to his settlement there as a minister. His father, however, had already formed the plan of his spending the ensuing winter at Edinburgh, and strongly dissuaded him from accepting the invitation to Chester, which would not only have rendered this plan abortive, but have compelled him immediately to break off his uncompleted studies at York. He accordingly went, in the autumn of 1808, to Edinburgh, where in the lectures of Playfair, Leslie, Home and Stewart, he found instruction of the highest excellence in those branches of knowledge which were least satisfactorily taught at Glasgow. My acquaintance with him began in

that year, in a visit which he paid to his brother Henry, then, with myself, a student at Glasgow. We were soon to be brought into more intimate connection. The friends of the College at York had been for some time endeavouring to place its funds in such a state as should enable them to engage a third Tutor, and thus to relieve Mr. Wellbeloved from a weight of multifarious duties which threatened serious injury to his health.* The acceptance of an invitation to the Octagon at Norwich, in 1809, by the Rev. Theophilus Browne, the Assistant Tutor, opened the way to a division of the office. Mr. Turner came back to York in the autumn of that year, as Tutor in Mathematics and Philosophy, and the remaining duties of the secular department were undertaken by me in the following session. From that time till his resignation in 1827, we lived together in harmonious co-operation with each other and our excellent Principal; and though the event may not altogether have realized the sanguine anticipations of our friend Mrs. Cappe, when she records the completion of the engagement of three Tutors, we may hope that our labours were not ineffectual. The object of all was the same; there was no jealousy or rivalry; each had his own sphere of duty, and an equal interest in the prosperity of the institution.

It is due to Mr. Turner's character to put on record what was the system of instruction in Mathematics and Physics, and in Mental and Moral Philosophy, during the time that he was Tutor in these departments. It will not only be a better memorial of his services than any general panegyric, but may be an interesting document in the history of Manchester College and of academical tuition in our body. The following account of it has been supplied by an old pupil, the Rev. Edward Higginson, the fulness of whose statement shews the care with which he followed the instructions of his Tutor, and who has already given proof, in his Funeral Sermon, of the respect and gratitude with which he regards his memory. It has reference to the maturest period of Mr. Turner's labours, a few years before his resignation of his office.

"Mr. Turner's MATHEMATICAL course was spread over the three first years of the Academical curriculum, with three lectures a week. The students of the first year (being required on admission to be well instructed as far as fractional and decimal arithmetic) were carefully initiated into Algebra as far as Simple Equations, and then were carried through the first six books of *Euclid*, with *Playfair's* additions and improved demonstrations (the second book being taught algebraically). Plane Trigonometry (*Bridge* and *Vince* the text-books) concluded the session. Each lecture began with a thorough examination in the contents of the preceding, the students being required to demonstrate what had been demonstrated to them by the Tutor on the previous occasion. The second year's Mathematical course opened with the Geometry of

* See Mrs. Cappe's Memoirs, ch. xlvii.

Solids, including Euclid's eleventh and twelfth books and the Conic Sections. *Newton's Conic Sections*, and that part of *West's Elements of Mathematics* which relates to the subject, were used as text-books. The latter being out of print, the students were encouraged to supply the want by taking down the demonstrations in their note-books from the Tutor's black board. Algebra was next resumed and pursued to its higher departments. The explanation of the construction of Trigonometrical tables followed; then Spherical Trigonometry, with *Vince* and *Woodhouse* as text-books. The application of Algebra to Geometry concluded the second year's course. In the third year, usually a diminished class proceeded to the investigation of Physical Astronomy, including the study of *Newton's Principia*; while it was not uncommon for those who had a less decided mathematical talent to repeat the second year's course instead. If there was a fault, indeed, in Mr. Turner's Mathematical course (his average students being judges), it was that of too great rapidity in going over his ground. But how difficult—nay, impossible—to supply the wants of the ablest and not go on too fast for the dull!

"During these second and third years of the College course, Mr. T. also gave two experimental lectures per week on Mechanical Philosophy and Chemistry.

"The MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCES formed a continuous, but very varied and comprehensive, course of three lectures a week during the second and third years of the students' residence in York College. It was Mr. Turner's method to lecture extemporaneously, in a conversational and familiar manner, but from carefully arranged notes, often introducing extracts from the writers with whom he wished to make his class acquainted. And throughout these courses, while on almost every subject he held very decided opinions, his leading object uniformly was to present every controversy, as far as possible, fairly before his pupils, and to bring them into acquaintance with all the principal writers on each side.

"The first three months were devoted to Mental Philosophy. *Belsham's Elements* was made the text-book, but merely the text-book, as containing a comprehensive introduction to the principal writers on the Philosophy of Mind. All these were fully described and fairly analyzed. In the resulting structure reared by the tutor, *Locke* was every where the base, and *Hartley*, with his well-grouped Associations, the clustered pillar of combined strength and beauty; while *Stewart* and *Brown* became, as it were, the stately and graceful arches spanning across to kindred pillars in all directions. Mr. Turner was a very decided and thorough Hartleyan; and as such, he was most earnest in claiming for the doctrine of Association that indispensable but very difficult act of justice, its intire separation from its gratuitous connection with the doctrine of Vibrations. Kindred only by their common parentage, the two doctrines have no natural or proper connection. The credit of the one is only perilled by the questionable presence of the other. What Priestley did to Hartley's volume, the philosophical world has gradually done, indeed, to the doctrines,—republished the Associative principle, omitting the Vibrations. Mr. Turner was rightly anxious to detach, in his pupils' minds, the former doctrine as unquestionably true and all-important in mental science, from the unnatural alliance into which its

author had forced it with the latter more than questionable fancy. The Hartleyan philosophy, thus simplified, he ardently followed into all its applications to mind and morals. With the Scotch philosophy of Instinctive ideas and 'Common-sense' principles (so called), he could keep no terms, being never satisfied to cut a knot which he thought he might by patient industry untie. On the doctrine of Innate Ideas, he carefully pointed out the deep wisdom of Leibnitz's addition to the maxim of the middle-age schoolmen, '*Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*,'—*nisi ipse intellectus*;—an addition which, if thoroughly appreciated, might perhaps help to settle some controversies that are still warmly waged, by distinguishing plainly between the *faculty* given by nature and the *materials* provided for its exercise and development. The Berkeleian Immaterial theory furnished Mr. T. with an admirable occasion for distinguishing between the evidence of the senses and the intellectual conclusions most closely connected with them. Phrenology (which he insisted upon calling *Craniology* as the properly descriptive term) he utterly repudiated, as a poor attempt to compass mental phenomena by rule and measure instead of consciousness and reflection. The abstruse questions of Time, Space and Personal Identity, came under discussion in their proper places.

"Moral Philosophy formed the business of the second three months in this class. This course contemplated two objects: to review the various theories which have been proposed on the nature and obligation of Virtue and on the subject of the Moral Sense, and to examine in detail the nature of all human duties. In default of a satisfactory class-book, Mr. T. from time to time issued to his class a syllabus of the next ensuing portion of the course, with the principal references to be consulted,—a plan which was continued in the Political Economy course. In the lecture-room this syllabus was filled up with familiar oral instruction, as already described, the students being encouraged (as in the College lectures generally) to take copious notes, which most of them did in short-hand.

"In that division of his Ethical course which treated of the Religious Sense, Mr. Turner, though denying 'a Religious Instinct,' did not dispute our inherent possession of a Religious *Faculty*; any more than, in denying 'Innate Ideas,' he disputed the faculty for obtaining ideas. The faculty in all cases he assumed as indisputable. His philosophy of the origin of intellectual ideas, moral sentiments and affections, in their respective faculties, was throughout consistently Hartleyan. And while he could find no sound basis for the Obligation of Virtue, short of its tendency, as ordained by the sovereign Will of God, to produce the ultimate and truest Happiness of the agent as well as others; he found in the benign operation of the Associative principle a sufficient vindication of his philosophy from the imputation of being *selfish*, in any bad sense of the term. The lectures on Providence and Prayer were very full and searching, and were as truly devout as they were philosophical.

"The third division of this course for second-year students was Political Philosophy and Political Economy. The former embraced a rapid yet comprehensive introduction to the leading writers on the origin and progress of civil society, government, &c., and on the principles of civil and criminal law, the duties of governors and governed, the comparative merits and evils of different forms of government, the law of nations.

Locke, Paley, Bentham, Millar, Craig, Basil Montague, Gisborne, Hutcheson and Godwin, with Montesquieu, Grotius, Puffendorf and Vattel, were the authorities referred to.

“The Political Economy course (with the Tutor’s own syllabus as text-paper) introduced the class to Adam Smith, Ricardo, Say, Malthus (who was thought to have made a true theory false, merely by putting it into a mathematical form, of which it will not properly admit), Torrens, Bentham, Macculloch and others. The high merit of this course may be estimated at once, from the fact that every economical change since made in the legislative order of things in England, has been made in strict accordance with the scientific principles taught by Mr. Turner thirty and forty years ago. Free-trade, especially in corn; the abolition of restrictive Navigation Laws (the last small remnant of which is now to be removed); the readjustment of fiscal tariffs; and the various other approaches made towards a fairer system of taxation;—have all been in exact accordance with the great principles of Social Economy taught to the pupils of Manchester College, York, so many years ago. Mr. Turner’s great leading principle in all these matters was, that ‘the *minimum* of human legislation is best.’ It was not with him the slovenly and scrambling *Laissez-faire*, which some are pleased to represent as the dictate of ‘hard Political Economy;’ but it was the scientific and religious conviction that the great Laws of Providence in the social order of things can no more be disregarded with impunity than Gravitation or Electricity. Sad experience and stern political necessity have since compelled the practical recognition of truths which, in the calm atmosphere of disinterested study, were as clear and beneficent as daylight to the young pupil, to whom Political Economy was presented as in fact the Economy of Divine Providence on behalf of the great family of mankind. So largely, wisely and religiously were its truths propounded.

“This course concluded the second year’s Philosophical studies. The third year’s class was designated the Logic class; but its business was of a somewhat miscellaneous nature.

“It began with a detail of some of the most interesting and important controversies in Metaphysics, such as the questions of Philosophical Necessity, Power, Materialism, &c. In these inquiries, the Tutor’s precision in defining terms and exactness in using them, were exemplary. How often did he shew that an acrimonious controversy was only a dispute about terms; or that there was truth on both sides, according to the light in which the respective halves of the question were seen!

“On the stupendous question of Liberty and Necessity (in which the Libertarian virtually adheres to the human point of view, while the Necessarian attempts to see the phenomena as with the eye, and from the throne, of God), it was evident that Mr. Turner held pretty completely the Necessarian theory, *as a theory*. Yet in his lectures on this subject in 1825, he thus candidly declared his own doubts and difficulties, plainly hinting, at the same time, that the dispute was, in most hands, verbal or technical, rather than real:

“‘This has been called by Hume the most contentious dispute in the most contentious of sciences. Thousands of volumes have been written, but the dispute seems hardly nearer to its termination. Interminable as this dispute appears, and great as have been the disputants, we may naturally imagine that the difference between them has existed more in

appearance than in reality, and that if they could be prevailed upon to define what they mean by the terms they use, and to abide by those definitions, we should probably find them to agree in every important point. As for my own opinion, I must confess that I have not been able wholly to satisfy my mind on the subject of Liberty and Necessity. Though the direct argument for Necessity appears unanswerable, yet the views which are deduced from the doctrine, even by Necessarian writers, are so startling, and it requires such an effort to accommodate our new views to the practice of life, and the use of Necessarian language to common language, that there are still some difficulties left on my mind.'

"The Materialistic argument he placed parallel with the Berkeleian in most instructive order for mutual commentary, and plainly regarded both theories as not only impracticable in common life, but as unphilosophically confounding together the very different phenomena of Mind and Matter. He put the merits of the question thus :

"The question is, whether Mind and Matter are two intirely different things; whether, in addition to the physical structure of the human frame, there is another principle intirely distinct, by which the operations of thought, feeling, will, &c., are carried on. With respect to the name Materialism, it may be doubted whether the arguments of Priestley and others go to prove that Mind is intirely material, or that Matter is intirely spiritual. It is a question of very little practical importance; and it is admitted on all hands that, as branches of human science, Matter and Mind are two intirely different things. Extension, figure, divisibility, &c., are totally different from thought, volition, affection, &c., considered as objects of human science. The one subject is to be pursued by observations made by our senses, the other by the information given us by consciousness. It does not, however, follow that extension, figure and motion may not belong to the same substance as thought and volition. These may belong to the same *substratum*. It remains to be inquired, whether the properties of Matter are consistent with those of Mind; and here the parties differ in opinion. For my own part, I have never been anxious to decide this question for myself, because it is of no practical importance; and, like Pope on the subject of the controversy between the Catholics and the Protestants, I have found myself alternately on the side of the Materialist and the Immaterialist. It appears no small recommendation of the system of Berkeley, that if we could only admit it, it would sweep away all this controversy at one stroke.'

"The review of Ethical Systems, which was entered upon at the beginning of the course just so far as to clear the way for the illustration of Human Duty, was now resumed more fully; and the system of Utility, properly guarded by the Associative principle from the low and narrow consequences often needlessly imputed to it, was distinctly and gratefully accepted as truly honourable to God, and persuasive, in appropriate accents, to men of every varying tone of mind and feeling.

"Logic, explained in its technical forms, and illustrated in its unformal application to fair argument and to the exposure of false, followed; and then came an interesting account of the origin and progress of the study of the Aristotelian Logic, followed by a clear analysis of Bacon's *Novum Organon*. Lectures on Demonstrative Evidence came next (Bed-

does being the principal reference); and the year's course concluded with an investigation of the principles of Moral Evidence, including the great questions of the Uniformity of Natural Phenomena and of Human Expectation as resulting from such experience, the possibility or probability of Miracles and their appropriate evidence, &c. *Gambier's Treatise on Moral Evidence* was here the chief reference; Hartley and Stewart were recalled to elucidate the Metaphysics of the subject; and Campbell, as well as Hume, was heard on Miracles, and Newcome Cappe on Faith."

Mr. Turner was probably more successful as a teacher of Mental and Moral Philosophy than of Mathematics. His own faculties of mind were peculiarly adapted for the cultivation of the latter science; and had he been placed in circumstances which would have encouraged or allowed exclusive devotion to it, he would no doubt have attained to great eminence as a mathematician. In the preliminary education of a Dissenting minister, it could, however, only occupy a subordinate place; nor was it always easy to impress on the minds of students in divinity that its place, though subordinate, was important and essential. There was seldom found among them or the lay students any desire to carry mathematical study beyond the ordinary limits of the course. Where, however, such a desire was manifested, Mr. Turner met and encouraged it by a cheerful devotion of his own time to additional instruction; and he was equally ready, with good-humoured patience, to remove the difficulties of those to whom mathematical reasoning was a perplexing process. Possibly he may have adhered too long to the method and notation in which he had been trained, while mathematicians in general were adopting a newer system.

On his marriage, in 1817, with Miss Benton, whose mother was a sister of Mr. Cappe's first wife, he went to reside at a short distance from the College, but returned to it in 1819 as sole Resident Tutor. The Dissenting Academy having been a developement of the family, something of a domestic character and discipline had always been supposed essential to it; and even when Manchester and Hackney had assumed the style and title of College, an attempt was made to maintain this character. It was evident that it could only be very imperfectly carried out by the residence of two, still more of one unmarried Tutor, within the walls. A strong desire was felt by the parents of the students and the College Committee, that they should enjoy the benefit of constant female domestic superintendence and society, which the circumstances of the Principal's family prevented his affording them; and Mr. Turner's recent union with a lady whose temper, discretion and amiable manners well fitted her for such an office, naturally suggested the offer of the Resident Tutorship, with the entire internal management, to him. He held this post till 1827. It had of course been attended with a great increase of anxious responsibility. He had always looked forward to the

exercise of the ministry, in whose duties he delighted, as his ultimate destination, and the change, if to be made at all, could not be delayed with advantage beyond middle life. He resigned his office, therefore, at the close of the session of 1826-7, and, after spending some months in different parts of England, settled at Halifax, in February 1829, as minister of the Northgate-End chapel. The College Report of the year, in noticing Mr. Turner's approaching retirement, assures him of "the grateful sense which the Trustees entertained of his long, faithful and valued services to the institution." Of the feelings with which he was regarded by his pupils, Dr. Hutton and Mr. Robinson gave so true and full an expression in their addresses at the last Quinquennial meeting, that it is unnecessary to do more than to refer to them. That meeting comprehended some of the earliest and some of the latest of those who had received his instructions; but all felt alike that he had laboured zealously, conscientiously and kindly, to promote their moral and intellectual improvement. He retained all his interest in the welfare of the College, and was rarely absent from its anniversaries.

The ministerial connection then formed lasted, with entire harmony and satisfaction, to the end of Mr. Turner's life; and the respect and affection which his flock have manifested on the occasion of his death, prove that they appreciated the earnestness with which he devoted himself to the duties of his office. His humane and kindly disposition made him readily answer every call for aid or sympathy, whether in his own immediate circle or beyond it. The variety of his knowledge enabled him to render most valuable assistance to several public institutions in Halifax, amongst whose busy population it was not easy to find men at once possessed of leisure to devote to their management, and qualifications for keeping up their courses of instruction. Mr. Turner had been early trained, by the example of his father, to this branch of philanthropic duty, and devoted a large portion of his time to the affairs of the British and Foreign Schools, the Mechanics' Institution, and the Halifax Literary and Philosophical Society. This last institution was formed soon after his settlement at Halifax. He acted as one of its Secretaries, and was always ready to supply papers for its meetings from his ample stores of scientific knowledge. During his residence at York, he had taken an active part in the foundation and management of the Savings' Bank. His powers of calculation enabled him to render important service in fixing its rates and regulations, and such a mode of encouraging industry and providence was in entire accordance with his principles of political economy.

The logical cast of Mr. Turner's mind was visible in his discourses from the pulpit as well as in his writings. They were composed on a definite plan, and a well-connected chain of argu-

ment established the truth which the text had suggested. Reasoning, however, was not substituted for the authority of Scripture, but employed to enforce it; and the argument, though sound and satisfactory, was never so subtle as to elude the comprehension of an auditor of ordinary intelligence and culture. The diction was clear and forcible, though unornamented; and if his sermons were not enlivened by imagination or animated by passion, they had always the charm of a serious earnestness, both of sentiment and delivery, which shewed the sincerity of the preacher's convictions. He neither shrunk from the introduction of doctrinal topics into the pulpit, nor did he make them the ordinary subjects of his discourses. He was firmly attached to the principles of Protestant Dissent and to the Unitarian creed; and ministering to a religious society which made those principles and that creed the ground of their separation from other communities, he thought it his duty from time to time to bring them before his hearers; but the great truths of religion, and the great practical duties of life, formed the staple of his preaching. A few specimens of his sermons are before the public. The earliest of them was delivered at Newcastle, in the year 1817, on New Year's day, and published at the request of the Hanover-Square congregation. The preceding year may still be remembered by some of our readers from the wide-spread commercial distress and embarrassment which followed what a great statesman of that day called "the breaking out of the peace." The public mind had not then been familiarized with those vicissitudes of prosperity and its reverse which have since become almost normal in our commercial history, and many persons apprehended that a period of decline had begun which would end in ruin. The sermon (which is founded on Ps. xxiii. 6—"Surely goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life") is directed partly to inculcate the general duty of a cheerful trust in Providence, founded upon past experience, and partly to counteract the feeling of despondency in regard to national affairs by the same consideration, and the suggestion of reasons for hope that better days were at hand. A few sentences may be appropriately quoted, as characteristic of those views of life and duty which were habitual to the writer.

"I know of nothing which has a happier tendency to improve the mind—to inspire us with cheerfulness and activity—to promote a generous, diffusive benevolence—to fill our hearts with gratitude and joyful confidence in the Great Disposer of all things—than a habit, which therefore it becomes us to cultivate with diligence and care, of looking as much as possible at the *bright* side of every object. Almost everything has a bright side, if we will only be at the pains to seek after it. By cultivating this habit, therefore, wherever we are placed, with whomsoever we are connected, we shall be enabled to extract from every scene and occurrence something or other that is consolatory or agreeable."

Another sermon of his which was printed was preached in 1830 before the West-Riding Tract Society, on 1 Thess. v. 7, and illustrates the truth, which some striking events of our own times confirm, that Divine Providence prepares, silently and in various quarters, the causes by which great revolutions are brought about; that it reserves the times and the seasons to itself; and that, when they occur, they usually take by surprise the generation which witnesses them.* His latest publication shews his undiminished interest in the institution in which so many years of his life had been spent. He had taken no marked part in the discussions respecting its removal to London, seeing difficulties on both sides of the question, and being by nature somewhat indecisive in practical matters,—a mental peculiarity which might be traced even in his ordinary manner. When, however, its removal was determined upon, he availed himself of his appointment as preacher of the annual sermon before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, to point out its claims to support, and urge them upon his hearers. The success which has attended the movement to obtain fresh subscriptions in London and its neighbourhood, owes something, no doubt, to his forcible statement and earnest appeal.

Mr. Turner's power of lucid arrangement and close reasoning never appeared to greater advantage than in his doctrinal tracts and lectures. In his *Remarks on the commonly-received Doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice*, he has happily brought ethics and scriptural criticism to bear in union on his argument; shewing, first, that the notion of a vicarious sacrifice is inconsistent with every principle of natural justice, and then, that it derives no countenance either from the sacrifices under the Law, or the figures and allusions of the New Testament. The *Thoughts on the Doctrine of Original Sin* exhibit the same combination of sound ethical principle with judicious explanations of scripture language; and in both the same desire is shewn to make the inquiry subservient to those practical results "which can alone justify the introduction of such discussions into a public congregation." The *Lectures on Protestant Nonconformity* were originally delivered at the monthly meetings of the Fellowship Fund, and were subsequently published in the *Christian Reformer*. They do not profess any novelty of research; but, in a small compass, and with great clearness of statement, without any bitterness or exaggeration, they furnish the Dissenter, and especially the Unitarian Dissenter, with abundant reasons for his Nonconformity.

His largest and most elaborate work was *The Lives of Eminent Unitarians*, in 2 vols. 12mo, undertaken at the suggestion

* The first volume of Dr. Beard's *Family Sermons* contains one by him on John ix. 4. A Charge by him is published in the *Service* at the settlement of his friend and pupil, Mr. Tagart, at the Octagon chapel, Norwich, in 1825.

of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The first volume contains, besides individual lives, histories of several Dissenting academies of the last century. Any one who should judge these volumes or estimate the labour of their author by their bulk, would apply to them a very unfair criterion. Only a limited space was at his command, and therefore it was equally impossible to engage in minute inquiries, or to employ that amplitude of detail, without which it is difficult to sustain the interest of biography. But though the treatment is concise, it is nowhere superficial; and what occupies a small space in the volume, was often the result of careful and prolonged inquiry. The works of the authors whose lives are related, were read by Mr. Turner with a special view to this undertaking, and the result exhibited in criticisms which will be found remarkable for their accuracy and soundness. The second volume is more interesting than the first. Biddle and Peirce and Emlyn, indeed, as sufferers for conscience' sake, excite our sympathy; but the quiet labours of Hallet, Lardner, Benson, Chandler and Taylor, however important in bringing about a change in the opinions of the Presbyterian body, raise no powerful interest. But Lindsey and Jebb and Priestley and Price and Wakefield not only belong more immediately to us, by their greater proximity in time, but interest us by the bold profession of the truth, and the intimate connection of their actions and writings with the state of opinion amidst which we live.* While all honour is awarded to those who witnessed a good confession, candid allowance is made for those who with the same opinions took a less decided course. Moderation of statement and candour in judging are characteristic of all his writings.

Mr. Turner wrote with great facility, and was fond of the exercise of his pen: he was accustomed to say, indeed, that he could seldom think to much purpose without a pen in his hand. Besides his separate publications, he contributed largely to the periodical literature of our denomination; sometimes with his own name or initials, more rarely with an assumed signature, as *Hæreticus* (M. R., VI. 205, probably his first communication), or that of V. N. (M. R., IX. 457), indicating his relation to the well-known *Vigilius* of the Theological Repository, whence his father's signature of V. F. was also derived. The Monthly Review for 1818 (Vol. LXXXVI. 260, 375) contains an elaborate article by him on the second volume of Dugald Stewart's Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind. It pays a just tribute to the eloquence and taste of Professor Stewart, laying open at the same time the weakness of some of his reasonings, and protesting against his depreciation of the theory of

* A third volume, we believe, was contemplated, which was to have contained the lives of foreign Unitarians.

utility in morals. I doubt whether his contributions to the *Monthly Review* went beyond that article. The *Transactions* of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester, of which he was an honorary member, contain some communications of his. The readiness with which he wrote, and the clearness of his written style, were in singular contrast with the difficulty and hesitation with which he expressed himself in extemporaneous speaking. It was a mark of the absence of all personal feeling, which was characteristic of him, that, notwithstanding this difficulty, he never declined any public duty which might be allotted to him, from an apprehension of appearing to disadvantage in comparison with more eloquent or ready speakers. He was fond of society and of conversational discussion. His acuteness and variety of knowledge made it difficult to obtain an advantage over him in the thrust and parry of argument; but he was no sophist contending for victory rather than for truth. The perseverance with which he maintained his opinions, was evidently the result of the sincerity of his convictions; and nothing was ever said by him designed to provoke or wound the feelings of the person with whom he was arguing.

Mr. Turner's gentle and affectionate disposition not only gained him the love of all who were nearly connected with him, but attached those who were brought into slighter and more casual relations to him. The local press of Halifax, on the occasion of his death, bore an emphatic testimony to the general feeling of his fellow-townsmen, beyond the limits of his own congregation, or the immediate circle of personal friends. "Among men of all parties and creeds," says one of these tributes to his memory, "Mr. Turner was respected. His character was singularly amiable and unobtrusive. To the utmost of his means, he was liberal and kind to the poor; his charitable deeds were unseen, but their cessation will now be felt. Thus, enjoying the esteem and respect of all, he kept on the even tenor of his way, and each revolving year found him still pursuing his quiet and unostentatious career." Mr. Higginson's account of the spirit of his political philosophy will have prepared every reader to anticipate his political position. Timid and doubtful in regard to the tendency of organic changes, he was the zealous friend of every measure of practical reform, the extension of religious liberty, the emancipation of trade, the diffusion of knowledge by education and the press; and though he never put himself forward as the leader of a party, he always supported by his vote and influence the Liberal candidate for the representation of Halifax.

For many years Mr. Turner enjoyed almost uninterrupted health. Some symptoms of disease had shewn themselves in the course of the last summer, but their indications were not considered to threaten immediate danger. In the autumn he left Halifax, and spent some weeks in the south, without apparent im-

provement in his health, but still in the possession of nearly his usual power of activity and enjoyment. On his return from Bristol, where he had joined the social circle of his friends with his accustomed cheerfulness, he had an alarming attack at Birmingham, which revealed the very serious nature of his illness; and after reaching home, he became rapidly worse. His death took place, suddenly yet not unexpectedly to himself or those about him, on the 30th of December, 1853, and his funeral on the 5th of January in this year. The service was performed by the Rev. Mr. Barling, formerly a minister among the Independents, but a convert to Unitarianism, who was an intimate friend of Mr. Turner's, and had officiated for him some time since his illness. Besides the members of the Northgate-End chapel, the procession to the cemetery was joined by the Council of the Literary and Philosophical Society, the Directors of the Mechanics' Institution, and the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society. The attendance would have been much larger but for the uncommon severity of the weather. A heavy fall of snow had blocked up the principal lines of railway, and prevented several relatives and friends from reaching Halifax, who would otherwise gladly have paid this mark of respect to the memory of an amiable and excellent man.

JOHN KENRICK.

COST OF WAR.

THE "Companion to the *Almanac*" for 1853, gives a very curious return, compiled from official sources, of the killed and wounded in the military and naval actions from 1793 to 1815.

	KILLED.		WOUNDED.	
	Officers.	Men.	Officers.	Men.
Naval actions	240	3,422	665	9,720
Military actions	920	15,214	4,685	64,639
Total	1,160	18,636	5,360	74,359

This return only includes British troops of the regular army. Nor does the table furnish a complete record of the loss of life and suffering during these years of the greatest wars of modern times, for it does not include the number *missing*, which is always considerable. What an aggregate of human suffering does the table present to our view! 20,000 human beings killed; 80,000 wounded, of whom a considerable portion died of their wounds, and another portion lived only to suffer. Besides these, many perished by sickness wholly incident to war.—A table of the pecuniary cost of the war from 1793, would be a valuable pendant. It is only partially given in this Year Book. From 1801 to 1814, the navy, army and ordnance of Great Britain and Ireland cost six hundred and thirty-three millions.

THE DEAD SEA AND THE BIBLE LANDS.*

WE took up these volumes with the expectation, from the name of the author, that we should find in them valuable additions to our knowledge of sacred geography; yet not without some apprehension, derived from the notorious qualities of the works which issue from Mr. Bentley's press. Our anticipations have in both respects been fulfilled; they contain a good deal of important information, but its amount is wholly disproportioned to the bulk of the volumes through which it is diffused. Retrenching the trivialities of the personal narrative, and the repetition of what was already well known, the book might well have been reduced to half its actual compass.

M. de Saulcy landed at Beyrout, and pursued the well-known track along the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, turning off to Jerusalem, whence he proceeded by the Valley of the Kedron and the Convent of Mar Saba towards the Dead Sea. It is not till he arrived at Sebbeh, on the western shore, that we find anything of novelty in his narrative, unless, indeed, that the leader of his escort shot a man, assumed to be a robber, in the neighbourhood of Naplous,—an occurrence now happily rare in these countries, and which we think might easily have been avoided by a little forbearance. Sebbeh is the Masada of Josephus, the scene of one of the most romantic narratives in his History of the Jewish War (vii. 8). It lies immediately opposite to that remarkable projection of the eastern shore which narrows the Dead Sea, and which still bears among the Arabs the name of El Lissan, "the tongue," given to it in the Book of Joshua.† After the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, three fortresses still held out: Herodium, near Bethlehem; Machærus, on the eastern side of Jordan; and Masada. Herodium was speedily reduced; Machærus, a place of great natural strength, surrendered; and Masada alone remained. From its position it seemed impregnable. It is a rock, rising to the height of more than 1000 feet, and surrounded everywhere by perpendicular precipices, except at two points. The access from the side of the Dead Sea is by a path so winding, that it bore the name of the Serpent; and so narrow, that he who climbed it could only find room to place one foot upon it at a time, and must be dashed to pieces if he made a false step. On the western side it was somewhat easier of access. The high-priest Jonathan had built a fortress, enclosing the little plain at the top, and Herod the Great had fortified it with works of great strength, and built himself there a palace, furnished with

* Narrative of a Journey round the Dead Sea and in the Bible Lands in 1850 and 1851. By F. de Saulcy, Member of the French Institute. Edited, with Notes, by Count Edward de Warren. 2 Vols. R. Bentley. 1853.

† "Their south border" (the tribe of Judah) "was from the shore of the Salt Sea, from the bay (לשן) that looketh southward" (Josh. xv. 2).

every means of luxury, with cisterns and magazines, enabling the occupants to weary out the patience of besiegers by a resistance of months and even years. The extreme dryness of the air and soil, and the saline impregnation of the atmosphere, render credible the assertion of Josephus, that some of the provisions which Herod had laid in, when he feared that Antony might attempt his life in order to bestow his kingdom on Cleopatra, were found unimpaired by decay in the Roman war, after the lapse of nearly 100 years. During the confusion which preceded the siege of Jerusalem, the Sicarii had occupied this fortress; and after the fall of Machærus, Eleazar, a descendant of Judas, "who led away much people in the days of the taxing" (Acts v. 37) by Cyrenius, threw himself into it with a numerous band of them, to try a last conflict for the independence of their country. Flavius Silva, the Roman general, was well aware in what a desperate struggle he was engaging when he undertook the reduction of Masada. The western path was blocked up by a tower of immense strength; but the ground on which it stood was commanded by a higher eminence, on which the Romans planted some of those machines of extraordinary power which Vespasian and Titus had invented for battering the walls of Jerusalem. When a breach was made, it was found that the besiegers had constructed within a rampart of earth and wood, not liable to be destroyed by the impact of the battering-ram. Silva, however, directed his men to hurl combustibles upon it, and the wind favouring, the whole was soon consumed. Eleazar himself, though he read an omen of the hostility of Providence in the wind which had consumed the bulwark, had no thought of surrender, and made a speech (or Josephus for him), in which he exhorted his followers to destroy their wives and children, their money and their fortifications, and finally themselves, leaving only their stores untouched, that it might appear that patriotism, and not famine, had been the motive of their deed. His first harangue did not raise them to the required pitch of fanaticism; he saw looks and tears which indicated to him that the thoughts of wives and children were uppermost in the minds of many among his followers, and he addressed them in a second and much longer speech. As given by Josephus, it is a curious specimen of that unseasonable eloquence with which historians of a rhetorical turn among the ancients embellished their narratives. The pith of it lies in the concluding sentences, in which he describes the outrages to which young and old, male and female, would be exposed in the event of their captivity, and urges them to die free. His words inspired them with a universal fury; they heaped together their property and set fire to it, having chosen ten men whose duty it was to put to death those who had not killed themselves, and finally to cast lots who should be the executioner of the other nine, and wind up the tragedy by suicide.

Two aged women and five little children alone escaped out of 960 persons. The Romans, when they entered the fortress, instead of triumphing as for a victory, were struck with admiration of the stern resolution and contempt of death which the besieged had manifested.

A place so distinctly marked by the hand of Nature as Masada, might have been expected to be recognized by every traveller in the Holy Land, and yet till lately it has been entirely overlooked. The truth is, that the vicinity of the Dead Sea is at once so inhospitable and so dangerous from the robbers who haunt it, that it long remained a *terra incognita*. Robinson, however, though he did not ascend the rock, examined it with a telescope from Engaddi, and discovered ruins on the top; and though at first, as he says (II. 240), the spot was a complete puzzle, subsequent research left him little room to doubt that Sebbeh was Masada, and he places it accordingly in his map. His prediction that future travellers would find on the spot confirmation of their identity, was soon fulfilled. Two of his countrymen, Messrs. Wolcott and Tipping, who were engaged in preparing a new and illustrated edition of Josephus, were the first who ascended (we think in 1842), climbing with hands and feet up the Serpent path which he describes. They found at every step confirmation of the accuracy of his account. The wall is reddened by the action of fire; the hill which commanded the wall still rises above it; ancient cisterns lined with stucco are found excavated in the rock; and the lines of the Roman circumvallation can be distinctly traced. During Lieut. Lynch's expedition to explore the Jordan and the Dead Sea (1848), Messrs. Dale and Anderson again clambered up the rock of Masada, and M. de Saulcy and his friends have the honour of being the third party who have accomplished the adventure. They were able only to bestow two hours on its examination; but their account fully confirms those of their predecessors, and their astonishment is not less at discovering the perfect correspondence between all the localities and circumstances and the description of Josephus. In one respect M. de Saulcy differs from the American travellers. There is a gateway with a pointed arch in one of the walls, which they regard as a later construction, while M. de S. admits it as an evidence of the existence of the pointed arch as early as the days of Herod the Great. We should require a more careful examination than could be made in a visit of two hours, before acquiescing in a conclusion so much at variance with archæology. This region was occupied by the Crusaders. Herodium, which we mentioned before, is called the Mountain of the Franks; and though we have no definite information of their having taken possession of Masada, we think it much more probable that the pointed arch is due to them, than to the architects of Herod the Great.

The great discovery of M. de Saulcy's travels, however, is the supposed site of the ruins of Sodom. In passing from Masada along the S. W. corner of the Dead Sea, he was struck with the appearance of ruins near the shore and on the adjacent hills, which are composed of mineral salt, and bear the name of Djebel Usdum, the Hill of Sodom. We presume the conception which most of our readers have formed from the scriptural narrative, or still more from popular commentaries upon it, of the fate of the Cities of the Plain, is, that the Dead Sea covers the submerged ruins of Sodom and Gomorrah. When Lieut. Lynch ascertained by soundings that the portion of the sea which lies south of the promontory of El Lissan is very much more shallow than the northern, it was supposed that this difference was owing to the subsidence of the cities. Yet there is no intimation of any subsidence in the narrative in Genesis (xix. 24, 25); and the subsequent allusions in Scripture (Jer. xlix. 18, Zeph. ii. 9) lead us to suppose that their site was still visible, bearing the marks of the conflagration by which they were destroyed. Josephus, in his *Antiquities* (i. 9), speaks of the city of Sodom as ἀφανισθείσης; but this by no means necessarily implies that it had been swallowed up. The word is of constant use in the Greek of the Septuagint for desolation and ruin; and in his *History of the Jewish War* (iv. viii. 4), he says that remains of the divine fire and shadows (σκιάς) of the Five Cities are still to be seen. Strabo's language is still more precise (xvi. 764). He says that ruins of houses still exist, and that, according to the tradition of the country, remains of Sodom had been preserved extending to sixty stadia. From these passages Reland long ago concluded (*Pal.* 254) that no submersion took place, but that the cities of the Pentapolis had been depopulated by fire, which left their ruins standing. As to the accounts which Maundrell says he received from credible witnesses, of ruins to be seen in the depths of the waters, they are to be classed with the belief of the fishermen of Lough Neagh, that submerged round towers are to be seen in it; or that of the natives of the coast of Coromandel, that the remains of Bali's capital are visible in the sea. They are the effect, not the cause, of the popular faith. There can be no doubt that the name Usdum is a genuine tradition of that of Sodom; for Galen calls the rock-salt of this mountain, "salt of Sodom." Few travellers have passed this way; but Seetzen, Irby and Mangles, and Robinson, all notice the salt strata, without, however, discovering any traces of ruins. M. de Saulcy, on his way round the south end of the Dead Sea to the country of Moab, tells us that at the foot of this mountain he discovered the remains of an ancient city, but passed on without any minute examination of them, intending to halt here on his return. Unfortunately, on his return the weather was most unfavourable; he and his escort were exhausted by the dangerous passage of the quagmire

which forms the south-eastern shore of the lake; they travelled in constant dread of the marauding Arabs; and the supposed ruins of Sodom were again passed without being explored. Only one of the party, Mr. Rothschild, disobeying M. de Saulcy's orders, ventured among them, but not a word is told us of his observations. We remain, therefore, in a most tantalizing state of uncertainty, without map, plan, measurement or drawing of these remains; and in the total want of such means of judging, we can only give a suspensive adherence to our author's very confident decision that they are the ruins of Sodom. Here, if anywhere, they are to be looked for; but it must not be forgotten that there was a "City of Salt" (Josh. xv. 62) in the neighbourhood of Engaddi, and that the position and structure of these remains would exactly correspond with it.

The position of Zoar must be decided by that of Sodom, from which it was distant only by a space which could be travelled between dawn and the time "when the sun was risen upon the earth" (Gen. xix. 15, 23). It could not, therefore, be where Reland placed it, at the south-eastern corner of the Dead Sea, still less where Robinson places it, near the mouth of the Wadi, which descends from Kerek (Kir Moab) to the Dead Sea. There seems no other assignable place for it than *Zuweirah*, a little to the north of Usdum; and the name confirms the supposition, if M. de Saulcy be right in assigning his ruins to Sodom. We do not, however, escape from all difficulties by this supposition; for the subsequent history would lead us to suppose that Lot's place of refuge was on the same side of the lake as was subsequently peopled by Ammonites and Moabites, that is, the eastern side; and Zoar is identified by ancient authorities with Segor, and placed in Arabia.

M. de Saulcy's travels in the ancient country of Moab extended as far north as Sihon. He discovered everywhere the ruins of nameless towns, indicating the great populousness of this region in ancient times; and, with that leaning which his book everywhere shews, to assign all ruins to the highest possible antiquity, attributes them to the times when Moab was an independent state. He even thinks that he has discovered a fragment of a bas-relief of ancient Moabitic sculpture, and the rows of stones which bordered the "king's highway" (Numb. xx. 17), along which the Israelites requested permission to march. On his return he visited Kerek, and experienced there the same fate as Seetzen and Burckhardt, Irby and Mangles, and Lynch,—to be fleeced by the Arabs, and be in no small danger of their lives. We must not complain that those who travel in such circumstances give us but vague accounts of what they see. There is little prospect of a better state of things. There is no controlling power, and all that the traveller can do is to purchase the protection of one lawless tribe against another; and when he has

done this, though he may not be betrayed by his guides, he can hardly reckon on their risking their own lives in his defence. M. de S. and his companions escaped from the clutches of Midjelly, the sheik of Kerek; but they owed more to their double-barrelled guns and eight-barrelled pistols than to his hospitality or honour.

On his return by Hebron to Jerusalem, M. de Sauley undertook another journey to the northern end of the Dead Sea. Here, according to his account, the same good fortune accompanied him, and he discovered the ruins of Gomorrah. The place to which he assigns them is about half way between the end of the Sea and the opening of the Kedron Valley. They extend, he says, in a continuous mass over a space of more than 6000 yards, about four English miles, and consist of walls, whose foundation-stones are enormous blocks of what may be called Cyclopean construction, a yard in thickness. That they should have escaped the observation of all travellers, seems the more wonderful, as Robinson actually passed this way, going from Engaddi to Jericho; but all he says (II. 252) is—"Near the fountain (Ain-el-Feshkah) are the foundations of a small square tower and other small buildings, whether ancient or not we could not tell." Indeed, according to M. de Sauley's own account, they might be easily overlooked.

"I have said that the ruins through which we are proceeding are not easily distinguished, and that it is very probable a hundred successive travellers might pass them without the slightest idea of their existence. This remark is so feasible(?), that on my first warning the Abbé Michon of their existence, he laughed in my face, as much as to tell me that I was dreaming. Luckily, the boundary ditch which we had to cross, and the walls that appeared next, enabled me to make him recognize, with his own touch, what I called ruins, and which, as he maintained, were merely heaps of stones thrown there by chance, through a freak of nature. The Abbé, who is always open to conviction, surrenders at once to conclusive evidence; and as soon as he has actually made out a single foundation of an ancient wall, he requires no further assistance from me to recognize the spot where ancient buildings once existed, of a strange, barbarous construction, characterizing a period certainly contemporaneous with the catastrophe of the Pentapolis."

The Abbé, who was an entomologist and botanist, was probably in a hurry to return to his own pursuits, or he would hardly have surrendered at discretion at the sight of a single foundation of an old wall, or admitted that a "strange, barbarous construction" was a proof of an antiquity of 3600 years. M. de Sauley, indeed, poses the sceptic by the question, If these are not the ruins of Gomorrah, what are they? We confess to having no answer ready; but we must wait for a much more deliberate and cautious investigation before we admit our author's conclusion. His principal argument is, that part of the ruins bears the name of Kharbet Oumran or Goumran, which resembles Gomorrah.

In this case, there is no tradition of identity, as in the case of Usdum and Sodom; indeed, the ancient geographers, Eusebius and Jerome, give us no account of Gomorrah, though they seem to have supposed it to be in the neighbourhood of Sodom. And M. de Saulcy admits that the description of the border of the Canaanites (Gen. x. 19)—“From Sidon unto Gaza, *as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah*, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha”—does not suit with his hypothesis, that Sodom was at the south and Gomorrah at the north end of the Dead Sea.

During his residence at Jerusalem, M. de Saulcy bestowed much attention on the many sepulchres hewn in the rock, by which it is surrounded. The locality is particularly favourable to this mode of sepulture. The Valley of the Kedron and its branches, the Valley of Hinnom on the west, and the Valley of Jehoshaphat on the east and north, are bordered by rocks easy of excavation, and are lined with tombs in various groups, which have been distinguished as Tombs of the Kings, Tombs of the Prophets, Tombs of the Judges, all these being in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, while the plebeian sepulchres are in the Valley of Hinnom. The most remote of these to the north are those which traditionally bear the name of Qebour-el-Melook, a name recalling the Bab-el-Melook, or Gate of the Kings, borne by the Theban Valley in which the royal sepulchres are found. Travellers have hitherto disregarded the tradition which this name implies, and have supposed that the ancient kings of Judah were interred on Mount Zion. M. de Saulcy maintains that the tradition is correct; that the Tombs of the Kings are the veritable places of interment of David, Solomon and their successors. The excavations in question are of a very extraordinary kind, and must certainly have been used for collective interments, as they contain the remains of more than one sarcophagus and chambers, strongly resembling in their arrangement those of the Egyptian hypogæa. Robinson, who gives a plan of them after Catherwood, was inclined to think that they are the monument erected by Queen Helena, the Adiabene, which Pausanias (viii. 16) describes as equal in splendour to the tomb of Mausolus. But Schulz has set aside this hypothesis, by pointing out elsewhere the tomb of Izates, and the foundation, still existing, of the three pyramids which characterized it. M. de S., adopting the traditional name, inquires to what kings can it apply; and having successively eliminated the Herodian family, Alexander Jannæus and the Maccabees, comes to the conclusion which we have mentioned above. Two formidable objections present themselves. All architects and antiquaries who have viewed these excavations have pronounced that their sculpture, triglyphs, pateras, fruit and foliage, belong to the Græco-Roman age, and cannot, therefore, have been the work of Jewish sculptors before the captivity.

The other is, that David is said (1 Kings ii. 10) to have been buried "in the city of David;" and in 1 Chron. xi. 5, it is said, "David took the castle of Zion, *which is the city of David.*" His place of interment, therefore, was Zion, not the Qebour-el-Melook outside the walls. To the latter objection, our author replies, that it is most improbable, and at variance with Jewish notions respecting the impurity contracted from a corpse, that the castle of Zion should have been the royal necropolis, and that we must understand "city of David" in a large sense, as meaning Jerusalem and its environs, as when it is said that the cemetery of Pere La Chaise is in Paris. To the objection derived from the style of art, he replies, that the inventions which we attribute to the Greeks—Ionic volutes, Doric triglyphs, &c.—are really due to the Egyptians, Phœnicians and Assyrians, in whose remains we find them long before the rise of art in Greece. This reply is less satisfactory than the preceding. The difficulty arises from the combination of these peculiarities, and the close resemblance to a style known to belong to the Greek and Roman times. Robinson truly says, that it is impossible not to be struck with their similarity to the works at Petra, which are admitted to be of a very late age; that of Herod appears to us the most probable; and we are by no means satisfied with the grounds on which our author decides that the Herodium was in an entirely different part of the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Should any fortunate accident bring to light remains of *old* Phœnician sculpture, we may be better able to judge whether the elegant sarcophagus-cover which M. de Saulcy has carried off to the Louvre, and designates as David's, be really the work of the cunning men whom Hiram sent to assist in building the temple. He speaks of having seen "Ionic volutes in Phœnicia and Moab," but unfortunately does not tell us where or with what adjuncts.

The last of M. de Saulcy's discoveries we have to mention is that of the remains of the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. He thinks he has found there an altar composed of ten blocks of stone, towards which each of the ten schismatic tribes contributed its share, and traces of very ancient constructions, which he says bear a remarkable resemblance to the Phœnician temples in Malta and Gozo. We must, however, again demur to his conclusions, finding that Robinson (II. 124) says, "The ruins of the fortress erected on Gerizim by Justinian are still seen upon the mountain, *bearing every mark of a Roman origin.*" Our author, indeed, objects, that they are not adapted for purposes of defence from their arrangement; but he appears to overlook the natural strength of the mountain, which was ascended by a staircase of 300 steps, of which the representation is to be seen on the imperial coins of Neapolis. That the original form of the ruins upon it should not be easily ascertained, is not wonderful, since, besides the Samaritan temple destroyed by Hyrcanus, a

temple of Jupiter and a church of the Virgin Mary are known to have been erected there.

Should M. de Saulcy prove to have made real discoveries in places visited by so many generations of travellers, which had escaped them all, the story of "Eyes and No Eyes" will have received a curious exemplification. Before we can adopt them, however, they must be examined and verified by persons less rapid in making their observations and drawing their conclusions, less confident in announcing them, than our author. With the exception of Jerusalem, he has given us everywhere little more than first impressions received in very hasty surveys.

One of the most startling annunciations in his book is, that the tablet said to be engraved on the rock at Nahr-el-Kelb, a little north of Berytus, beside an Assyrian tablet representing an invading monarch, has absolutely no existence. "I positively declare," says he, "that these Egyptian basso-relievos, as well as the hieroglyphical texts appended to them, are a mere invention. The surfaces are perfectly smooth, and have never been carved, any more than the cornices upon which the same persons have pretended to place winged disks, according to the Egyptian fashion. The presence of the Egyptian sculptures at the Nahr-el-Kelb must consequently be numbered among the forgeries upon which some scholars, with perfect good faith, have wasted their sagacity." (II. p. 656.) If this be a forgery, it is one of the most unprincipled that literary and antiquarian history exhibit. The first notice of these Egyptian tablets is due to Mr. Bonomi, who, in the 9th part of Landseer's *Sabæan Researches*, published in 1835, has given a drawing of one of them, and adds: "The most ancient and unfortunately the most corroded of the antiquities, are three Egyptian tablets. On them may be traced, in more places than one, the name, expressed in hieroglyphics, of Rameses II.; to the period of whose reign any connoisseur in Egyptian art would have attributed them, from the beautiful proportions of the tablets and their cavetto mouldings." Lepsius, in his *Letters* (p. 402, Germ.), says: "The following morning I examined more minutely the sculptures beside the artificial way, which is now nearly destroyed, and I was able to decipher a date in hieroglyphic characters. Among the three Egyptian representations, which have all the shield of Rameses II., the middlemost is dedicated to Ra, the most southern to Ammon, and the most northern to Ptha." It is impossible for us to withhold our belief in the testimony of two such men as Bonomi and Lepsius, and we must therefore conclude that M. de Saulcy is endowed with a very peculiar faculty of vision, and while he can see that which no one saw before, is blind to that which is palpable to every one else.

Our author has been more fortunate in a translator than many foreigners who have lately been brought before the English

public; but he appears more at home in oriental than in classical philology. The practice of the French to change Dionysius into Denys, and Stephanus into Etienne, has been a trap to many of those who do French authors into English, and the present translator has not escaped it. In "Stephens's Ethnicals" (passim), the reader may not at once recognize the *Ἑθνικά* of the geographer Stephanus of Byzantium.

K.

 CENSUS SUNDAY.*

MR. HORACE MANN has prepared for the use of the Registrar-General a statement of the results of the inquiries made when taking the Census in 1851 respecting religious worship in England and Wales. The Report appears to have been drawn up with proper impartiality and commendable care. We propose in the present article to extract the statistics therein contained relative to the Unitarians of England and Wales, and afterwards to make some more general remarks upon the unique event of Census Sunday, and upon the curious document resulting.

Returns were received at the Census Office from 229 Unitarian congregations. The number of sittings in the 229 places of worship was 68,554, affording $\cdot 4$ or $\frac{2}{5}$ of a sitting to every 100 inhabitants of England and Wales, and $\cdot 7$ in proportion to the total number of sittings provided by all bodies. The estimated total number of attendants at Unitarian places is 37,156, being in the proportion of 2 to every 1000 of the entire population, and 5 to every 1000 of the number of attendants of all denominations. The proportion of Unitarians who attend worship, on the average of *three* services per Sunday, compared with their number of sittings, is very low, being only 24 per cent., the same proportion as exists amongst the Jews; but their average of *morning* attendance is 41, that of the Church being 47, Independents 49, Baptists 26, and Wesleyans 34. The only denomination in which the proportionate attendance is less is the Friends. But these observations shew the proportion of each sect to its buildings, rather than of its attendants to its members. Of the 229 Unitarian societies, 217 have separate buildings, 12 have not a separate building. The number of free sittings is 23,153, of appropriated sittings, 37,787; the number of sittings not distinguished is 2830. The number of attendants, March 30, 1851, was—in the morning, 27,612; in the afternoon, 8610; and in the evening, 12,406. There were open in the morning 183 places of worship; in the afternoon, 85; and in the evening, 114. From

* Census of Great Britain, 1851. Religious Worship of England and Wales, abridged from the Official Report made by Horace Mann, Esq., to George Graham, Esq., Registrar-General. (By authority of the Registrar-General.)

a table of the dates at which the chapels were erected, it appears that 147 were erected before 1801, 8 between 1801 and 1811, 14 between 1811 and 1821, 12 between 1821 and 1831, 15 between 1831 and 1841, and 18 between 1841 and 1851; of 15 the date of erection is not returned. 212 Unitarian places have sent in complete returns as to sittings, 17 incomplete. The average number of sittings to each Unitarian place is 299, being 3 above the average of all places. In respect to attendance, 222 congregations sent in complete returns, 7 incomplete. The total number of attendants in the course of the day was 50,061. The total number of sittings in Unitarian places open in the morning was 60,044; afternoon, 21,887; evening, 39,264.

Unitarian accommodation and attendance is thus stated in the several towns mentioned:

	<i>No. of Sittings.</i>			<i>Attendance including Sunday Scholars.</i>		
	<i>Free.</i>	<i>Appropriated.</i>	<i>Total.</i>	<i>Morning.</i>	<i>Afternoon.</i>	<i>Evening.</i>
Bath		300	300	175		120
Birmingham (5) ..	1634	1450	3084	1852		631
Bolton	14	600	614	530	180	
Bradford	30	400	430	126		102
Brighton (2)	450	652	1102	674		242
Bristol (2)	320	670	990	690		320
Bury	12	690	702	334	202	
Cheltenham	300		300	72		35
Chester		250	250	102		57
Coventry	200	200	400	325		110
Derby			450	217		107
Devonport	300		300	190		230
Dudley			500	190		182
Exeter	100	700	800	364		250
Finsbury	20	180	200	130		
Great Yarmouth ..	50	350	400	210		130
Huddersfield	100	120	220	120		90
Hull	90	400	490	220		130
Ipswich	50	800	850	310		450
Kidderminster	50	500	550	311		157
King's Lynn	146	104	250	120		
Leeds (3)	690	550	1240	506		227
Leicester	20	450	470	350		280
Liverpool (4)	181	1610	1791	985	57	328
London (2)	300	620	920	252		110
Macclesfield	100	250	350	150	300	
Maidstone	150	250	400	138		50
Manchester (4)	620	2080	2700	1210	160	500
Marylebone	50	450	500	300		200
Merthyr (2)	260	200	461	263		204
Newcastle-on-Tyne						
(2)	257	815	1072	461		118
Northampton	95	195	290	230		160
Norwich	120	380	500	491		136
Nottingham	60	550	610	606		
Oldham	48	140	188	115	88	

	No. of <i>Sittings</i> .			<i>Attendance including Sunday Scholars.</i>		
	Free.	Appropriated.	Total.	Morning.	Afternoon.	Evening.
Plymouth (2)	168	506	674	213		209
Portsmouth	80	520	600	144		292
Preston		145	145	86		40
Rochdale (2)	40	380	420	330	330	
Sheffield	50	850	900	650		350
Southampton	70	400	470	267		336
Southwark	350	50	400	55		120
Stockport	50	400	450	250		150
Sunderland	250	50	300	20		200
Swansea			400	157		121
Tower Hamlets (2) .	270	500	770	228		263
Wakefield		500	500	243		84
Warrington	250	250	500	198		58
Wolverhampton (2) .	346	200	546	340	280	58
York	10	30	40	97		60

The Unitarians in 41 towns have services in the morning only; in 4 towns in the afternoon only; in 30 towns in the evening only; in 26 towns in the morning and afternoon; in 53 towns in the morning and evening; in 2 towns in the afternoon and evening; and in 1 town in the morning, afternoon and evening. In the rural districts, 9 places have service in the morning only; 2 in the afternoon only; 6 in the evening only; 33 have service morning and afternoon; 5 have service morning and evening; 2 in the afternoon and evening; and 15 in the morning, afternoon and evening. The total of town congregations is 157, and of rural congregations 72. Out of every 100 sittings belonging to Unitarians, there were occupied by attendants in the morning, 41·5; in the afternoon, 13·0; in the evening, 18·5; making a total of 24·3.

It is evident, on the face of this list, that in some cases the returns have been given on a different principle from the rest. Take the two congregations of Bath and Cheltenham as an instance, places somewhat resembling in the character and habits of their inhabitants. Here the Unitarian chapel accommodation is equal in number: in the former place all the sittings are entered as appropriated, while in the latter they are all entered as free. How is this? In the York return there is evidently an error. The total sittings are entered at 40 (in fact, the number of pews; there are more than 300 sittings), in which, on the Census Sunday, 97 sat in the morning and 60 in the evening! Is it true that there are two Unitarian congregations at Brighton, two at Plymouth, and two at Wolverhampton? The General Baptists, who are Unitarian in sentiment, are not included in the returns now quoted, but are counted (in number 93 congregations) under the general head of Baptists. Nor do we see among the "isolated congregations," whose classification must have somewhat puzzled the officials, any mention of the "Christian Brethren," whose members are considerable in the North and in

Staffordshire, and who are distinctly Unitarian. We have, indeed, in this list, "Christians," 96 congregations (15,796 sittings); "Neutral," 1 congregation (500 sittings); "Free Gospel Christians," 14 congregations (2855 sittings); "Non-sectarian," 7 (2230); "No particular Denomination," 7 (575); "Free Church," 8 (3020); "Doubtful," 43 (4888); "General," 2 (130); "Rational Progressionists," 1 (300 evening attendants); and we find it difficult to imagine that the chief part of these, with names so plainly deprecatory of doctrinal orthodoxy, can be otherwise than free in doctrine. There are also enumerated of "Free-thinking Christians" (known Unitarians), 2 congregations, with 256 sittings; and of "Freethinkers" (we know not who or what these are), 2 congregations, with 125 sittings.

The *Census Sunday* of 1851 was a new department in the decennial numbering of the English people. "For the *first* time in the history of this country," says the Preface to the document now before us, "a Census of Religious Worship has been obtained by the Government. We are now able to ascertain the entire number of places of worship, the particular sects to which they respectively belong, the number of sittings provided by each sect, and the actual attendance on a given day."

The mode of procuring and digesting the returns is described in the Appendix to Mr. Mann's Report, and copied into the Preface of the abridged statement, which has been compiled for general use at a very low price. It being doubtful, at least, whether the language of the Census Act authorized the *enforcement* of this part of the inquiry under its penal sections, the Registrar-General caused it to be explained on the face of the *forms* of inquiry, that it was quite optional to answer the questions or not, but highly desirable that they should be answered. Wonderful to say, the chief recusants were, not the representatives of Dissenting congregations, but clergymen, "several of the clergy having entertained some scruples about complying with an invitation not proceeding from episcopal authority." A second application was in such cases made direct from the Census Office, "and this was generally favoured by a courteous return of the particulars desired." Still 2524 cases remained in all, where no information could be got; and for these Mr. Mann endeavours to supply proximate estimates by way of average or guess, as may be. It is highly to the credit of the good sense and good feeling of Dissenters in general that they facilitated these returns; for we confess we should not have been surprised had the new-born anti-State-Church zeal of a large class of Dissenters forbidden them to assist or recognize a State inquiry into their churches. But the handsome figure which they anticipated making, and which they *do* make in the returns, rendered their voluntarism, we suppose, very proud of doing what was wanted, as it was scrupulously explained to be not on compulsion! We do not

quite see why State help in education might not also be voluntarily received, as well as State help in religious statistics. But let that pass. Even the uncompliant "Friends" have sent in their returns, shewing an apparent decline of their body from 413 meeting-houses in 1800, to 371 now, and explaining it by the tendency among them of late "to migrate from the rural districts and to settle in the larger towns."

The ratio of increase per cent. in the largest three sects (as measured by sitting accommodation), Wesleyans (all branches), Independents, and Baptists (all branches), is given for the decennial periods as follows:

	Wesleyans.	Independents.	Baptists.
1801—'11.....	80·0	24·7	31·6
'11—'21.....	85·0	29·2	36·4
'21—'31.....	68·2	35·2	37·9
'31—'41.....	69·2	30·4	34·7
'41—'51.....	40·3	24·9	27·7

The diminished rates of increase of later years are explained by remarking, that "there is not room for such a rapid increase as formerly, since the aggregate increase during the half century has been more rapid than the increase of population." Yet the greatly diminished rate of the Methodist denomination is remarkable; and is yet more so, when we remember that the Wesleyan Reformers are still reckoned in the above table, though withdrawing 100,000 members from the Old Connection.

A most laboured and ingenious effort is made in this Report, to estimate the adequacy or inadequacy of existing church and chapel accommodation to the amount of population. Statistics, having to do with "facts and figures," *seems* the most certain of sciences, and yet it is one of the most liable to mistake. Though there is no uncertainty in arithmetical processes, there may be much in the data or assumptions on which they are based. Given certain numerical facts, arithmetic deduces conclusions that must be true to the thousandth part of a man or of a sitting in a church. Supposed certain other things not known as facts, arithmetic with equal exactness brings out the decimal of every person or thing under consideration; and both sets of figures look equally formal and clear. But we must distinguish here, as in all statistical tables, between actual returns (themselves, indeed, only proximate) and the supplements conjecturally added to them, and also the principles of computation hypothetically assumed in the use made of them.

Thus Mr. Mann *assumes*, as a reasoning, not a statistical, datum, that the amount of church and chapel accommodation "proper to be furnished for a given population," is 58 per cent. Some have said 70, some 75; Dr. Chalmers said $62\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This

is a mere matter of opinion. And how is the opinion come to? By deducting the supposed amounts of young children, aged, infirm and sick people and their attendants, and of those engaged on public conveyances, &c., so as to leave the supposed number of those who could, if they liked, be at religious services all *at once* throughout England and Wales. Mr. Mann takes these to be 58 per cent., or 10,398,013 (the population being 17,927,609). And there are sittings provided (including an estimate for the 2524 places unreturned) for 10,212,563, leaving a deficiency of 185,450 sittings. This, however, implies a greater proportionate deficiency in some places than in others; indeed, in some there seems an excess of accommodation, as in Colchester, which has enough for 73 per cent. of its population, and Wakefield, which has nearly 70. Taking all these and other matters into consideration, the writer of the Report concludes that an additional supply is wanted of 1,644,734 sittings (or 2000 churches), chiefly in the *large town districts*, and more especially in London; which new accommodation he thinks the Church of England should aim at supplying, for the sake of the most neglected parts of the population. We doubt whether this is, except in a few places, even a part of the true remedy; and we assent rather to the discouraging picture given of the prevalence of *practical secularism* and its causes (p. 93—), which are plainly quite inaccessible to such means of cure.

The actual attendance on Census Sunday in all churches and chapels together, was, in the morning, 4,647,482; afternoon, 3,184,135; and evening, 3,064,449; giving a total of 10,896,066 *attendances*; that is, half a million more than would have sufficed for every person attending *once* who is estimated as capable of going out *at once*. But many attended twice, and some thrice; and our statisticians are determined to arrive at conjectural figures, if they cannot have real ones, as to these proportions; so Mr. Mann computes (by suppositions that are quite arbitrary, though likely enough) that 7,261,032 different persons attended, some on one service, some on more. We doubt the wisdom of these merely conjectural statements. More important facts are ascertained, however, with as near an approach to accuracy as is practicable.

The proportions between Church and Dissent are now matter of public record. For every 100 sittings provided by the Church of England, the sects (not including Romanists) furnish 93. The Church had open at the three services 10,353,732, against 9,651,438 of the Protestant Dissenters, on Census Sunday. But the sects use theirs much more in the evening than the Church does hers. To shew how much is *got out of* their buildings by the Church and Dissenters comparatively, a table is given to the effect that, out of every thousand sittings,

	The Church has open	Dissenters have open
Morning	912	736
Afternoon	708	508
Evening	327	827
Total	649	690

Mr. Mann's statistical genius expresses this proportion in another way that is rather amusing. Churchmen attended on Census Sunday 5,292,551 times, and Dissenters, 5,603,515 times. "Or if we assume that a service on an average occupies *an hour and three quarters*, it would seem that the 3,773,474 Churchmen devoted 9,261,962 hours to religious worship (or $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours each), while the 3,487,558 Dissenters devoted 9,806,151 hours to a similar duty (or $2\frac{3}{4}$ hours each)." (P. 91.) But this calculation is still incomplete, until some returns shall be furnished, or mathematical estimate made, of the average length of Church and Dissenting services respectively; one of the few points, the very few, which seem to have escaped Mr. Mann's penetration. We quote the above, as shewing his indefatigable industry and ingenuity, while justifying a good-natured laugh at the statistical mania.

The prominent facts elicited by the whole inquiry are summed up (p. 102) in this paragraph:

"The great facts which appear to me to have been elicited by this inquiry are,—that, even taking the accommodation provided by all the sects, including the most extravagant, unitedly, there are 1,644,734 inhabitants of England who, if all who might attend religious services were willing to attend, would not be able, on account of insufficient room, to join in public worship; that this deficiency prevails almost exclusively in *towns*, especially *large towns*; that, if these 1,644,734 persons are to be deprived of all excuse for non-attendance, there must be at least as many additional sittings furnished, equal to about 2000 churches and chapels, and a certain number more if any of the present provision be regarded as of doubtful value; and that even such additional accommodation will fall short of the requirement if the edifices are so often, as at present, closed. Further, it appears that as many as 5,288,294 persons able to attend, are every Sunday absent from religious services, for all of whom there is accommodation for at least one service; that neglect like this, in spite of opportunities for worship, indicates the insufficiency of any mere addition to the number of religious *buildings*; that the greatest difficulty is to fill the churches when provided; and that this can only be accomplished by a great addition to the number of efficient, earnest, religious *teachers*, clerical or lay, by whose persuasions the reluctant population might be won."

We must not omit to mention one of the most valuable portions of this Report; not the less so for being, as it were, a gratuitous and extra-official portion. The first fifty-six pages are devoted to a history of the progress of religious opinions in England, and a description of the various classes of unendowed

churches. This summary is peculiarly clear, candid and just. Dr. Evans's "Sketch" cannot exceed it in candour, nor equal it in clearness and succinctness. The author derives his account of each sect from their own statements, though seldom formally quoting. His account of the Unitarians is scarcely to be found fault with. But Milton's *last thoughts* were not semi-Arian.

"Differences of opinion respecting the person of Christ are very ancient. Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, whose name is most familiar in connection with the anti-Trinitarian dispute, existed early in the fourth century, but Sabellius had preceded him in the third, in propagation of very similar sentiments. The 'Arian heresy' provoked extensive discord in the general Church; and we read of states and princes choosing sides in this mysterious controversy, and undertaking sanguinary wars for its decision. The 'heresy' prevailed to some considerable extent in Britain in the earliest period of Christianity, before the arrival of the Saxons.

"In the sixteenth century, another form of anti-Trinitarian doctrine was originated by Lælius and Faustus Socinus, and obtained a wide success in Poland. From these two prominent maintainers of their sentiments, the modern Unitarians are often called 'Socinians;' but they themselves repudiate the name,—in part because of a diversity of creed on some particular points, and partly from repugnance to be held as followers of *any* human teacher. In Switzerland, Servetus, by the instigation or consent of Calvin, was burnt, in 1553, for entertaining these opinions.

"In England, also, similar sentiments prevailed about the middle of the sixteenth century, and subsequently two Arians were burnt to death in the reign of James the First. John Biddle was imprisoned for the offence in the time of the Commonwealth, and died in prison in 1662. Milton was a semi-Arian. But little progress was effected till the opening of the eighteenth century, when many of the old Presbyterian ministers embraced opinions adverse to the Trinitarian doctrine. A noticeable controversy on the subject was begun in 1719, in the West of England, and two Presbyterian ministers, in consequence of their participation in these sentiments, were removed from their pastoral charges. Nevertheless, the Presbyterian clergy gradually became impregnated, although for some time they gave no particular expression from their pulpits to their views in this respect. In course of little time, however, their congregations either came to be entirely assimilated with themselves in doctrine, or in part seceded to the Independent body. Thus, the ancient Presbyterian chapels and endowments have, in great degree, become the property of Unitarians, whose origin, as a distinct community in England, may be dated from the first occurrence of such virtual transfers, viz., from about the period just subsequent to 1730.

"The modern Unitarians differ from the ancient anti-Trinitarians, chiefly by attributing to the Saviour less of divine and more of human nature. Indeed, he is described by several of their most conspicuous writers as a man 'constituted in all respects like other men.' His mission was, they say, to introduce, by God's appointment, a new moral dispensation; and his death they look upon not as a sacrifice or an atonement for sin, but as a martyrdom in defence of truth. Not ad-

mitting the essential sinfulness of human nature, they do not admit the necessity of an atonement: they consider that a conscientious, diligent discharge of moral duties will be adequate to secure for men their future happiness. In consequence of their disbelief in the divinity of Christ, they avoid all personal addresses to him, whether of prayer or praise. The Scriptures they believe to contain authentic statements; but they do not allow the universal inspiration of the writers. Many of the modern Unitarians believe that all mankind will ultimately be restored to happiness. This creed is very prevalent amongst the Unitarians of America, where upwards of 1000 churches are reported to profess it. It is there called 'Universalism.'

"Persons denying the doctrine of the Trinity were excepted from the benefits of the Toleration Act, and remained so until 1813, when the section in that statute which affected them was abrogated. Since that period they have been exactly in the same position as all other Protestant Dissenters with respect to their political immunities.

"The form of ecclesiastical government adopted by the Unitarians is substantially 'congregational,' each individual congregation ruling itself without regard to any courts or synods.

"Returns have been received at the Census Office from 229 congregations connected with this body."

But Mr. Mann scarcely does justice to the great and evident theological progress of the Independents, in saying that "the doctrines preached when Independency was first announced in England, were the same as those now heard from nearly every Congregational pulpit." And after alluding to the Congregational Union formed in 1831, it seems odd that the writer should say, "the doctrines of the Congregational churches are almost identical with those embodied in the Articles of the Established Church, interpreted according to their Calvinistic meaning;" and should refer to the "Declaration of Faith," &c., issued by the Union in 1833, as "furnishing ample evidence of this substantial harmony." We know and believe and hope better things in reference to the Independent body. The signs of the Congregational Union justify a very different interpretation. They must and will go forward, as they are doing. Their Independency is the essence of their position; the Calvinism of their founders was but its accident.

OBEDIENCE.

I assure them, if they will trust a man of some reflection and much experience, that the resources of a persevering, litigious, dissatisfied obedience, are much greater than those of almost any force, even if any force they had.—*Burke on the Irish Rebellion.*

THE PHASES OF FAITH.*

It must be well known to most of our readers, that the publication of the first edition of Mr. Newman's *Phases of Faith* was followed by the appearance of a work entitled *The Eclipse of Faith*. Without professing formally to reply to the *Phases*, that work dealt with the principal arguments advanced by Mr. Newman. It obtained great popularity, and was generally regarded as successful in the accomplishment of its intended purpose. Mr. Newman inserted in the second edition of his *Phases* a chapter professing to be a *Reply* to the *Eclipse*. This *Reply* has given rise to a little work under the title of "*A Defence of the Eclipse of Faith, by its Author*," to which we desire to call the particular attention of our readers. Our own conviction is, that it fully answers to its title, though it has, in a lesser degree, some of the faults of the former production. Its wit is too predominant, and its objections sometimes want qualification; but as to all that is important to the controversy, it does not leave Mr. Newman a leg to stand upon. We recommend it especially to those who are at all inclined to look up to him in the character of an authority. Whatever other value his statements and opinions may in future have, they will certainly cease to be received on account of the supposed competency or accuracy of their author. The false position in which he had placed himself, was indicated throughout the last edition of his book, by the irritation he constantly displayed. One could not but feel that a temper so prone to take personal offence, and to impute unworthy motive, was not to be trusted in its influence upon the judgment; but the degree to which that faculty has been actually perverted, can be scarcely imagined by any one who has not read this *Defence*. We intend to avoid, as much as possible, all that personally concerns the combatants in this controversy; but we cannot resist giving one specimen of the manner in which Mr. Newman's air of assumption is met by his opponent.

"He has said more in *one* chapter in this new edition of the '*Phases*'—to say nothing of his '*Soul*,' and nothing of his '*Hebrew Monarchy*'—to wound and shock the religious feelings of his countrymen—to jar their inmost sense of all that is most sacred—than any other writer of his day. Yet no sooner does any one proceed to expose his own religious system—which seems so unreasonable to the world, that probably not twenty people in it would profess adherence to it—than he looks grave, and protests against levity in the treatment of *sacred* things. I must answer, like Pascal when the Jesuits brought against him a similar charge, that '*I am far enough from ridiculing sacred things in ridiculing such notions.*' Mr. Newman warns me with much solemnity against

* A Defence of "*The Eclipse of Faith*," by its Author: being a Rejoinder to Professor Newman's Reply. Pp. 218. London—Longman, Brown and Co. 1854.

thinking that 'questions pertaining to God are advanced by boisterous glee.' I do not think the 'Eclipse' is characterised by '*boisterous glee*,' and certainly I was not at all aware that the things which *alone* I have ridiculed—some of them advanced by him and some by others—deserved to be treated with solemnity. For example—that an authoritative external revelation, which most people have thought possible enough, is *impossible*; that man is most likely born for a dog's life, and there an end; that there are great defects in the morality of the New Testament, and much imperfection in the character of its Founder; that the miracles of Christ might be real, because Christ was a clairvoyant and mesmerist; that God was not a Person, but Personality;—I say I was not at all aware that these things, and such as these, which alone I have ridiculed, were questions 'pertaining to God,' in any other sense than the wildest hypotheses in some sense 'pertain' to science, and the grossest heresies to religion."*

Mr. Newman's indignation was especially excited at a statement in the Eclipse to the effect that the same objections which he urged against Revelation, might with equal fairness be urged against Natural Religion. We have said, in a previous article, that we cannot entirely concur with the manner in which this argument is conducted. It is brought to bear upon "the divine original of the Bible," instead of the divinity of the religious truth of which the Bible is but the record; and it exaggerates the difficulties which beset our belief in the moral government of the world. It would have been strengthened, and not weakened, if in both these respects it had not gone for too much as an argument. It is, however, quite pertinent and sustainable; and Mr. Newman overstepped the utmost bounds of decorum when he said of it—"The author, speaking under a mask, uses a bold licence of blasphemy against Nature and its God, which too clearly comes from the heart." The reply to such imputations is quite triumphant. We can do no more than extract a few sentences of it, which we are afraid will suffer from being taken from their connection; but we make the extract in the hope that it will lead to an acquaintance, on the part of our readers, with the whole course of reasoning from which it is taken.

"Mr. Newman will have it that God could not have commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, as an exercise of his obedience, even though he did not permit the sacrifice, because it is inconsistent with man's 'little wisdom' and 'little love and goodness' to suppose it. I ask, then, how he makes it consistent with those same infinitesimals, that God, every day and all day long, and in all parts of the world, does things, and allows things to be done, equally baffling to the conceptions of those same infinitesimals; involving innocence and guilt in indiscriminate suffering, and permitting the infliction of all unutterable wrongs without an attempt to prevent or, in this world, to redress them? . . . Is not God good, then, even in these things? Yes, I say: yes, with an unflinching

* A Defence, &c., p. 4.

faith: but I *believe* it, and cannot *see* it: these things are what *we* should call 'harsh, cruel and unjust in man,' and are utterly incomprehensible to our 'little wisdom,' and 'little goodness,' and 'little love;' just as his command to exterminate the Canaanites, though not *so* perplexing, nor a tenth part so perplexing, is also incomprehensible. But I believe that God is good, *in spite* of these facts. Mr. Newman, on the other hand, says, in effect—'I believe the last-mentioned fact incredible, because it contradicts my moral and spiritual convictions of what God would do. It attributes to God what would be 'harsh, cruel and unjust in man,' and *therefore* I must reject it. The other facts I can see are quite consistent with all the said convictions.' Try your hand on them, then, I say, and shew it. Shew that they would not be 'harsh, cruel and unjust in man,' equally at war with man's 'little wisdom,' 'little goodness,' and all the other little things.... The reasons which make certain facts of the universe conformable to Mr. Newman's intuitions, and certain facts of scripture *not* conformable, must be given. That is all I ask. Instead of complying, Mr. Newman turns round and says, 'He perceives that I believe in an *unmoral* Deity!' Let us see whether I do; but whether, at the same time, I am not rather more consistent than he in the uniform exercise of faith. When the young bride walks to her home, with sunshine in her heart and on her path, and all life is full of promise and of hope before her—what is God then? Good, we say. And what is he when we see the same bride smitten down and carried to the sepulchre almost before the bridal chaplet has withered in her hair, and her widowed husband returns to his desolate hearth with a broken heart? What is God then? Good, I say: Oh, doubtless good; but in strong faith I say it, not because I can comprehend it; for man's 'little wisdom' and 'little goodness' would never have thus clouded the young dawn of hope and love. And when the young mother, in ecstacy of maternal joy, clasps her blooming child to her bosom, and blesses God for the life he has given, what is God then? Good, I say. And what is he when the same mother watches, in agony and tears, through weeks of wasting sickness, the same young face, from which the bloom has all departed, and begs, but begs in vain, as she gazes on sufferings which, after all, but faintly reflect her own, that God would be pleased in mercy to resume the life he had given? What is God then? Good, good, I say still; though thus to have searched and wrung the fibres of a mother's heart, would have been harsh and cruel in man, with his 'little wisdom' and his 'little love.' 'I find no difficulty,' Mr. Newman must say, 'in allowing that God can do all this in harmony with my 'intuitions' of equity, justice and goodness; but I *cannot* believe that, *for any purpose in the universe*, even for the instruction of all ages, he would, *half as much*, have tried the heart of the faithful patriarch.' I say, why? I beseech you, why? Instead of answering, Mr. Newman says, 'I perceive, Sir, you believe in an *unmoral* Deity.' And when the 'gentle west wind ungirds the bosom of the earth,' and flowers and blossoms spring forth at its bidding, and all nature laughs in the sun, and in the prophecy of plenty,—what is God then? Good, all nature says, rejoicingly. But when the 'heavens are brass' and the 'earth iron,' or the 'winds of death' cover the ocean with wreck, suffocate the caravan in the desert, or fill the city with sickness and pestilence, or locusts strip in an hour the fruits of God's bounty and man's

industry, and leave his creatures to die,—what is he then? Good, still I say: I doubt it not—good and just and holy still. But, oh God! ‘clouds and darkness are round about thee,’ and man’s ‘little wisdom’ and ‘little goodness’ cannot penetrate thee: I *believe*, but cannot *see*, that ‘justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne.’ Shrouded in tempests, thy path tracked with earthquake, and pestilence and famine, ‘how unsearchable are thy judgments, and thy ways past finding out’! I do not see, virtually replies Mr. Newman,—I do not see that these *natural* events, comprehensive, and as far as we can see indiscriminating, as are the ruin and the agony they bring, are anything but what may be quite made to harmonize with man’s notions of what is just, and good, and kind: but I cannot believe that the God who can blamelessly do all these things, irrespective of degrees of guilt—nay, to millions who could have none—would have ever enjoined the destruction of the Canaanites, let ‘their iniquity have been ever so full.’ Why so? I ask. How do you *discriminate* the two classes of facts, so as to shew that, *though* the one would be harsh and cruel in the light of our moral and spiritual judgments, the other would not be?—‘I perceive,’ is still Mr. Newman’s only answer,—‘I perceive, Sir, that you believe in an *immoral* Deity.’”*

“If the *positive* evidences for Theism, and the *positive* evidences for Christianity, be found of force, we cannot allow the parallel *moral* difficulties still besetting *both* to be treated on totally different principles. Reason for both, if you will, or Faith for both, if you will; but not Reason to object to the latter, and then Faith to digest the former. We will not be told that our reason is to bow to the one, and then to rebel against the other, because *some* man tells us that God cannot do this or that, when not only do we see that he *does* similar things (which you tell us are to be received by faith alone), but the *generality* of men themselves tell us that they can as soon apply faith to the one class of difficulties as the other.”†

Mr. Newman’s Phases of Faith has been twice reviewed in the pages of this Magazine. On both occasions attention was particularly directed to his sentiments on three points: The historical form in which revelation is transmitted to us—the manifestation of moral perfection made through Jesus Christ—and the authority which ought to be conceded to Christianity. We will now furnish our readers with a few extracts from this *Defence*, bearing upon each of these points in turn.

Referring to the historical transmission of revealed truth, Mr. Newman had said, in his Book on the Soul:

“In fact, all Christian apostles and missionaries, like the Hebrew prophets, have always refuted Paganism by direct attacks on its immoral and unspiritual doctrines, and have appealed to the consciences of Heathens, as competent to decide in the controversy. Christianity itself has thus practically confessed, what is theoretically clear, that an authoritative external revelation of moral and spiritual truth is essentially impossible to man.”

To this it is well answered:

* A Defence, &c., pp. 42, 44, 45.

† Ibid. p. 64.

"May it not be asked, what evidence *would* satisfy any body in the world that the apostles confessed that an authoritative revelation of moral and spiritual truth was impossible to man, when they at the very moment professed to be giving it,—claiming men's obedience to it, and receiving their homage? making known, as they said, 'what eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor had entered into the heart of man to conceive'? But, not to content myself with an appeal to the reader's common sense, let us test it by experience. There is some savage cannibal, I suppose, who is ready to gobble up his fellow-man, or a worthy creature, who puts his children out of the way with as little remorse as you would drown a kitten, devoutly worshipping at the same time a wooden thing, which certainly is not the 'likeness of anything in heaven above, nor the earth beneath,' and so far does not infringe upon the second commandment. Well, you naturally think his moral and spiritual perceptions somewhat out of sorts. The missionaries, worthy souls, succeed in convincing him of his abominable errors, and in amending his practice. 'Ah,' then cries the savage, 'I see a thing or two. It is true that you found me dining upon my neighbour, and quite ready to dine upon you; murdering my children, and living in all sorts of licentiousness and beastliness without compunction. Yet let me tell you, Mr. Missionary, you could not have given me 'a revelation' of all this error unless I had had faculties which could be educated to the perception of it; and I therefore conclude that an authoritative revelation of moral and spiritual truth is impossible!' What, think you, would the missionary reply? I apprehend something like this: 'My good Mr. Savage that *was*, I perceive you have a little of the savage about you still, or at least I should say so, only I perceive that it is possible for highly civilized folks to be of the same way of thinking. Just as it is because you are a *reasonable* creature and not an *idiot*, that I can instruct you in anything, so it is because you had a spiritual faculty—though, as your sentiments and practices too plainly shewed, in a very dormant state—that a revelation was *possible*; not *impossible*, my good friend. It was because your faculties were asleep, not dead, that I could awaken them. Had you *not* had those faculties which, you so strangely say, render a revelation *impossible*, it would have been impossible; it was possible only because you had them.' Thus I imagine the missionary would answer; and thus apostles would have answered, instead of befooling themselves by saying that that very authoritative revelation which they declared they came to make known—to which they claimed obedience, and to which men actually submitted—was impossible."*

On the subject of the perfection of the character of Christ, we are happy to say that justice is done to the views of those who entertain the Unitarian doctrine concerning his person.

"The *ordinary* Unitarian believes, at all events, that Christ was preternaturally endowed as no man ever was before or will be again—miraculously commissioned to make good his lofty claims—and invested with the character of the judge of all men. Any argument on the assumption that, supposing Christ to have been man only, *therefore*, however preternaturally endowed by the Father of Lights with knowledge, wisdom and virtue, it was *impossible* he should exhibit a perfect *human* excellence,

* A Defence, &c., p. 83.

but must have been encompassed with imperfections and foibles because a *man*, would be to them simply ridiculous. If Mr. Newman assert it, as, by consequence, he must, with his theory of the Finite, the Unitarians would do well to hold him to a full proof of this pretty little metaphysical theorem, that God either never *would* or never *could* enable a single individual of our race to exhibit a perfect human wisdom or a perfect human virtue. It will last *his* time."*

We can give no more than the conclusion of a very fine passage, descriptive of the influence exerted by the character of Christ; but we repeat the hope that what we do give will operate as an introduction to the rest.

"At his feet, guilty humanity of diverse races and nations for eighteen hundred years has come to pour forth in faith and love its sorrows, and finds there 'the peace which the world can neither give nor take away.' Myriads of aching heads and weary hearts have found and will find repose there, and have invested him with veneration, love and gratitude, which will never, never, be paid to any other name than His. . . . Multitudes of the loftiest minds have deeply investigated his claims, and admitted them; Genius of the highest order in science and poetry and art, has brought its richest trophies, and humbly laid them at his feet; the very chiefest of the Western sages, like those of the East, have come to offer him 'frankincense and gold and myrrh,' the noblest offerings of intellect, the divinest performances of art. Genius, true to its instincts after the beautiful and the sublime, even when it has not been constrained to pay a homage yet better than that of the intellect and the imagination, has not been insensible to his claims; it has poured forth a richer tribute to his honour than all the Mythologies of Antiquity could boast. He it is whose character and image have chiefly weaned men from their base idolatry of mere Power and Intellect, and made them see that in moral greatness there is a radiance brighter still. He it is who has chiefly made them recognize the essential identity of the 'beautiful and the good.' No one of the human race has exerted one thousandth part of the power, directly or indirectly, in moulding the thought and feeling, in developing the practical energies of the most various and cultured nations of the earth. . . . In the midst of the most literate and cultured ages which the world has yet seen, and which Christianity itself has tended to produce (for they have sprung up contemporaneously with its influence, and its realms still mark, with more distinctness than anything else, the frontiers of intellectual day and night, being brightest where it is brightest, and usually brighter than elsewhere even where it is comparatively dim), in *these* ages, Christ still holds his own; and though in the very midst of his church rise from time to time an endless succession of adversaries, they cannot prevail. Its followers retain their faith; genius, large, cultured, comprehensive, soberly declares its evidence impregnable. Pascal and Butler, and men like them, endowed with the most comprehensive minds, after the profoundest study, have bowed at the Redeemer's shrine; and the greatest master of Epic song, rich with the culture of all ages, 'rich with the spoils of time,' whose strains so emulate that still sublimer poesy on which his lofty muse was

* A Defence, &c., p. 139.

modelled, *believed* when he wrote his *Paradise Lost*, not merely that he was 'adorning a poetic theme,' but that he was celebrating fact:—the conflict of Immortal Hate and Immortal Love. Who shall dissipate this deep illusion thus inveterate and solicited by every means of cure, but in vain? And is this Personage, who has so taken captive the sons of men, and so inscribed His image on the soul of humanity, likely to be injured by a little bit of carping and captious sophistry? The critic might as well stretch out his hand to pluck Orion from his sphere."*

A sentence or two more, on the authority that ought to be conceded to Christianity, must close the present article:

"It appears that there is a convenient distinction to be made between what is morally and spiritually *instructive* and what is morally and spiritually *authoritative*. I answer, in sound only, not in meaning. For to convince any one who believes in a God and moral and spiritual truth at all, of any moral and spiritual truth—no matter how the man who imparts it came by it—whether he got it direct from heaven, or it has percolated through a hundred minds before it reached his—is *ipso facto* to make it authoritative in the sense, that it is felt it *ought* to have authority; though whether it will *have* it will depend marvellously upon whether it be believed to come certainly and immediately from God or not. He who knows what he means when he talks of *God* and his *claims*—*man* and his *duty*—will smile at the paradox of any moral or spiritual truth being proved to him—no matter how or by whom—while yet it is considered optional with him whether he shall regard it as merely instructive and not authoritative."†

"In admitting that books on spiritual and religious subjects may be instructive, Mr. Newman admits all that is essential to the argument. *Instructive*. Yes: but if books be *so* instructive as to teach men who have no scruple in banquetting on their fellow-creatures—in strangling their new-born infants—in exposing their partners—that all these things are 'abominations'—then in such instruction is shown plainly the possibility of an external revelation: it is to teach men to recognise doctrines which were before unrecognised—to realise truth of which they were before unconscious—and to practise duties they had never suspected to be duties before. If this be so, then the argument returns, that what man can do, God can surely do, and do much more effectually, both as regards the things taught and the manner of teaching them. Will it be any gain to Mr. Newman's argument to say, that a book of divine '*revelation*' of moral and spiritual truth is impossible to man; but that he never meant to deny that a book of divine '*instruction*' in moral and spiritual truth was possible? The concession of the *principle* that from *without* there may come a light which may develop into act the latent moral and spiritual capacities of our nature, is sufficient for the overthrow of his dogma, 'that an authoritative revelation of moral and spiritual truth is essentially impossible to man.'"‡

Γ.

* A Defence, &c., pp. 143, 144, 146.

† Ibid. p. 89.

‡ Ibid. p. 92.

INAUGURAL LECTURE DELIVERED BY REV. JAMES MARTINEAU,
PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN MANCHESTER NEW
COLLEGE, IN UNIVERSITY HALL, ON TUESDAY, FEB. 7th, 1854.

It has been thought proper that the opening of a new department of instruction within these walls should be marked by a few words, addressed less to the students who will stately assemble in the class-room, than to the friends of the two institutions which are happily united under this roof. The late period at which this duty is devolved upon me, renders it unseasonable for me to speak of the auspices and hopes with which Manchester New College, as a whole, has commenced its metropolitan existence. Concurring in every sentiment uttered upon this subject on a more important occasion, and adding only a hearty congratulation on the encouraging experience of the last three months, I retire at once into the particular province assigned me, and will endeavour to explain the relations it bears in a comprehensive scheme of intellectual culture. In doing so, I shall be on my guard against the temptation, which besets every teacher,—not from any vain self-exaggeration, but from the deep persuasions of a limited experience,—to over-estimate his own special field of study. Indeed, there is nothing here to challenge such a tendency into action. Elsewhere, there are persons with whom it is a traditional habit to disbelieve all mental and moral science. Others, in the zeal of a new conversion, see in the metaphysician only the lingering ghost of an age found dead upon the shore of time; and assure us that when the pious care of M. Comte has scattered sand enough upon the corpse, the spectre will vanish by the Stygian way. Had I to address judgments thus pre-occupied, I might be betrayed into too strenuous a vindication of a favourite pursuit. But I meet here those with whom a respect for philosophy is an inheritance and a necessity; who cannot but honour a study conquered for them by the sagacious genius and illustrated by the noble truthfulness of Locke; whose earnest meditations, both of thought and piety, have been in the companionship of the pure-minded Hartley; who are not less conscious than I am myself of unspeakable obligations to the versatile, comprehensive and guileless Priestley; and on whose shelves you rarely miss the acute and thoughtful volumes of Price. When I remember how largely the divinity of Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, was affected by the studies which belonged to him as Ethical Tutor at Warrington, and how closely the name of Enfield is preserved in conjunction with that of Brucker, and, in general, how much our freer theology owes to the just balance of critical research and speculative reflection, I feel that there are pledges in the past for a worthy appreciation here of philosophical pursuits, and am resolved not to endanger that wholesome pre-disposition by immoderate and untenable claims. At the same time, there is

danger as well as honour in belonging to a class rich in noble antecedents; danger of mistaking the heritage committed to our trust;—of cherishing with faithful pride the particular judgments delivered to us from the past, and letting slip the habits of severe activity, the fresh hopes of truth, the resolve to take a master's measure of the time, which saved our predecessors from merely repeating the symbols of an earlier age. Unless thought perpetually renews its youth, and lifts a seeking eye afresh to the living light, decrepitude and waste befall whatever it has achieved; for the world's effective wealth is not so much in any deposit of hoarded truths on which the key of preservation can be turned, as in the circulation of immediate thought, based, no doubt, upon that ancient store, but bringing into comparison the products and values of the hour. This is the great difference observable between physical and moral knowledge. The former, once gained, is capable of being embodied in practical arts, and handed over in its uses and applications to men and times quite unequal to its original apprehension; the latter remains all through absolutely dependent on the minds that deal with it,—lives with their life, dies with their death,—and, though surviving as a habit or a formula, sinks, among the superficial and the unfaithful, from an inspiration to an inertia. You might set up the electric telegraph among the New-Zealanders, and train them to its use; and the Indians and Chinese are said to have command of many mechanical rules and astronomical methods, the grounds of which they have for ages ceased to understand. A people thus the depositary of a transmitted skill may continue, amid stagnation or decline, to send their messages and construct their almanacs with curious precision, and may profit by the science of the past. But the higher truths of morals and religion have another abode than in posts and wires, and cannot be laid down in cables through the sea; no equation can contain or usage work them. They subsist only for him who discerns them freshly out of himself; they are realized in so far as they are apprehended; and their very use and application being at the heart instead of the surface of our nature, their function is extinct when they cease to be re-discovered and re-believed, and are only remembered and preserved. In other words, it is the thirst for fresh truth that alone can retain the old; and the intellect, not less than the character, will not even hold its own when it ceases to pray and to aspire. It is the peculiar office of philosophy to sustain this unexhausted energy of hope, this search after a deeper and more comprehensive conception of things. Other pursuits may do more to increase the stock of positive and definite knowledge; but without *this* to furnish impulse and interpretation, their zeal is unspeakably lowered, and their results are but a barren sand-heap of particulars. That in stating this I make no arbitrary assertion, and point not even to any accidental fact, but to a necessary and

universal law, may, I think, be made manifest to any moderately reflecting person. All knowledge, it is evident, is a *relative* apprehension of things, a *plurality* of which is necessary to constitute every cognitive act. It involves in every case a process of *comparison*, resulting in a perception of resemblance and difference. Nothing can be put, as it were, into a mental vacuum, and known in and by itself; but even the simplest affirmation you can make about it, assigns to it a character by which you *discriminate* it from what it else would be. Say it is *red*, and you pick it out from the other colours; say it is *round*, and you shut the door on the remaining forms; say it is *one*, and you imply that it might have been more. The *expressed* term, whatever it be, which you employ, is significant only with reference to another which is *suppressed* and held behind it; and your assertion may, with equal propriety, or at least with identical result, be regarded as an affirmation performed upon the one or a negation upon the other. The negative sphere, however, being indefinite, and required for the moment only as a background to throw out the positive image, is apt to elude attention and perform its function quite secretly; so that many persons may even be unaware of this necessary dualism of thought. Yet it is certain that, if we never look at our background, the objects in front will not shew right; and illusion is just as possible by error in the mind's neutral tint, as by a false laying on of the pure colour. A *relation* cannot be rightly apprehended till you can take your stand at either end to contemplate the other at will,—till you are equally familiar with both its terms; and that which remains negative to the unreflecting, may, in its turn, become positive to you. That this ability to shift the mental station, and deal freely with the two sides of a relation, is the genuine mark of human intelligence as distinguished from animal sagacity, will hardly be denied. A dog recognizes his master by certain characteristics, the absence or disguise of which would baulk his instinct, and so far his intelligence avails itself of the same guidance as ours; but I do not suppose that he gives any account to himself of his grounds of judgment, or can set forth the signs which he observes over against the others from which they are differentiated. If you say that he *knows* the person, at all events he does not *know how he knows*. The same character of *immediate*, in opposition to *reflective* apprehension, belongs to all the lower grades of human intelligence. The craftsman who can perform some act of manual skill, he cannot tell you how,—the shrewd observer who reads off a posture of affairs by happy guess,—the arbitrator who reaches a right decision by a path he is unable to explain,—may all of them indeed possess great force of understanding, giving them vast advantage over weaker men who, with more ability to say what they are doing, have nothing half so well worth telling: but it would assuredly be better for themselves and for the world,

could the road of their thought be traced on the permanent map of human existence, and did they move over it with open eye, instead of being carried to their destination in a trance. The utmost attainment reached by this practical class of men, is the accidental possession of correct conceptions, unsecured by any mastery of their *grounds*, and unqualified by any sense of the relative merits which other opinions may possess. This itself, even should they never make a mistake, falls far short of that view of things which distinguishes a scientific intellect: it is an intrusion of brute instinct into a region beyond its proper range: it has all the unsocial, isolating character of a power that can neither teach nor learn, and which, accordingly, the possessor has all to himself; and misses the genial tendency of that broad human intelligence which, relying on its own like workings in every mind, looks out for mutual communion, exchanges interrogation and reply, learns to confess itself and ask for help, and feels itself in sympathy with the life of the universe and the thought of God. Hence it is men of intuitive sagacity, unsoftened by a large speculative discipline, are usually dogmatical and overbearing; announcing their judgment, but scarcely knowing how they formed it; content, when asked to defend it, with announcing it over again; or else pouring out a torrent of pretended reasons, turbid in itself, and often remarkable for washing their conclusion right away. Indeed, dogmatism, so far as it has its seat in the intellectual habits, rather than in a culpable self-will, seems to consist precisely in this,—that you apprehend your object as immediately given, carrying straight on to it your own pre-conceptions and forms of thinking, and letting your mind work upon it instinctively and unwatched; and, never dreaming of any possible speck upon your glass, and borrowing another to try again, you insist that the reality is and must be what you see. In such a state of feeling, the circle of relations in which the object is discerned is too narrow, and in each instance is too much contemplated from one end to give scope for that sentiment of wonder and reverence which Plato pronounces to be the beginning of wisdom, or that sense of the largeness of truth, which is as water to the root of intellectual modesty.

Each of the great departments of knowledge engages itself with its own peculiar system of relations. The *physical sciences*, which investigate *nature*,—the *literæ humaniores*, which study *society* and its products,—*theology*, which seeks for *God*,—severally occupy themselves with comparisons and groupings exclusively within their respective provinces. Under the first, the discrimination of types among integral individuals constitutes, e.g. natural history; the primary attributes of body yield the quantitative sciences; the secondary, those of quality. Under the second, the languages, the literature, the politics, the individual lives, the national histories of men, are brought into a circle and

made to strike the lights of mutual analogy and contrast. Under the third, some positive religion (Christianity, for instance) is passed through the series of possible schemes, till it reveals their essence and its own. In every instance the same truth holds good,—that your knowledge consists in the perception of relations; is extensive, in proportion as they are numerous; and profound, according as you are familiar with each relation both ways or only one. You understand a particular kind of animated being, when looking inwards you see how its parts constitute a system, and again, looking outwards and around, how this system stands with regard to other types of organized existence. You are acquainted with a literature, when the characteristics of its poets, its historians, its philosophers, co-exist in your conception, and, as the collective expression of the genius of a people, the whole can be assigned to its place among the products of the human mind. And you understand Christianity as a divine agency in history, when amid its versatile manifestations you can trace the fibres of a common spiritual life pervading all, and can group around it its analogues and contrasts in the series of faiths and philosophies.

But besides these special relations proper to each sort of knowledge, there is *one* which is co-extensive with knowledge itself and is constitutive of its very nature; viz., the relation between the knowing faculty and the known object, be it what it may; between the power that thinks and the reality that is thought. Plant the mind where you please on the field of existence, it will carry *itself* thither,—will look out of its own window, and see nature through the framework of its own limits and the shade of its own colour. What it perceives must be contingent not less on its own constitution than on the constitution of the object. Whether there is any rescue for us from this dependence, whether we can ever pretend to reach *things as they are*, or must be content with them *as they appear*, it is needless now to inquire. It is plain, at all events, that we make no approach to such rescue by studying more, and ever more, of mere external matters; for should there be illusion at all lurking in the form of thought, it does but multiply itself with our intellectual action, and is only more monstrous in the learned than in the nescient. If there be hope at all, it must be sought in the inverse direction, by turning round upon the inner side of knowledge, and scrutinizing the mind's act instead of the mind's object; by ascertaining what sort of business this is that goes on in our person, when we perceive and judge and think and will. Certain it is, that it is an affair which is conducted sometimes better, sometimes worse; and if we can only find out where the difference lies, and learn to detect the admitted signs of perversion when we see them, we shall at least get rid of all artificial incumbrance of error, and strip the faculties bare to their native configuration, and watch the undisguised play of their natural action. Is it too

much to say, that, all knowledge being relative, it only half exists till you are familiar with this *home-term* of the relation?—that, while you remain fixed upon the *foreign* one, you may have indeed correct apprehension, but no finished insight? This perhaps is the ultimate meaning of the Socratic dictum, that *Self-knowledge* is at once the condition and the complement of all other; twin-birth of the same instant, placed by kindly nature in the same incunabula, and intended to advance *pari passu* to maturity. Socrates felt that there had been a fatal separation between physical and moral studies, between the quest of nature and the interrogation of thought; and by making it his art to probe the rational consciousness and bring ideas to the birth, he intended not to set up any rival knowledge, so much as to penetrate to the ground of all knowledge. Nor is it less true now than it was then, that a profound introspection, a systematic psychological vigilance, is needed as a running commentary on the cyclopaedia of external fact and history. I will not say that you may not be a good geometer without appreciating the logical nature of axioms and definitions; or an excellent astronomer without troubling yourself with controversies respecting force and causality; for each science is at liberty to build upon its own foundation, as ready-made and given, and has only to state its own first principles, and not to ground them. But though, under these conditions, you may possess yourself of the contents of many sciences, you will understand the rationale of none; and with ever so perfect an apprehension of the nexus among the parts, the validity of the whole will float in the mist of insecure hypothesis. This state of things is, in the long run, exceedingly hurtful to soundness and largeness of judgment; and when the time comes for discussion to pass out beyond the professional circle of facts and laws into wider relations, embracing many sciences or transcending all, none are so apt to be bewildered and without a clue, swaying by unsteady impulse into credulity or scepticism, as those who have been imprisoned in a particular province, and have cramped their mental aptitudes to the shape of its special logic. We are constantly told, indeed, by those who imagine the new *Organon* to have superseded the old, that false metaphysics are the sure parent of false science. But they forget that *no-metaphysics* are sure to be *false*. For what are they? Their negative name is a delusive mask; and no man can reason on these matters at all, no man can even rail at metaphysics, without a metaphysic hypothesis at heart; and the only question is, whether he will reverently seek it by wide and patient toil, and, consciously possessed of it, call it by its name, or whether he will pick it up among the accidents of another quest, and have it about him without knowing what it is. Nothing is more common than to see maxims, which are unexceptionable as the assumptions of particular sciences, coerced into the service of a

universal philosophy, and so turned into instruments of mischief and distortion. That "we can know nothing but phenomena,"—that "causation is simply constant priority,"—that "men are governed invariably by their interests,"—are examples of rules allowable as dominant hypotheses in physics or political economy, but exercising a desolating tyranny when thrust on to the throne of universal empire. He who seizes upon these and similar maxims and carries them in triumph on his banner, may boast of his escape from the uncertainties of metaphysics, but is himself all the while the unconscious victim of their very vulgarest deception, and does but chase the mirage which they always create when their atmosphere is putrescent with materialism and moral decay. And surely the longer you make the catalogue of offences charged against false philosophy, the more do you complete the argument for the study and the search of true, as the only possible or even conceivable corrective; for it is needless to say, you cannot exclude the ideal theory by chemistry, or encounter Spinoza with geologic laws, and clear the field of David Hume with the widest sweep of comparative grammar. The very mischief and perversions of human judgment which you deplore, and which occupy so large a place in the history of civilized nations, cannot be appreciated except by a mind sensitive to logical distinctions, and able to see its way amid the shades of deep reflection. The most serious and solemn expression in which the feeling and character of other ages have embodied themselves,—I mean the mythologies and theologies of ancient heathen and Christian nations,—must present a melancholy aspect of absurdity and logomachy to one who has no key of metaphysic fellow-feeling wherewith to enter into their inner significance; he must remain stranger to the best intellectual feature of the present time, the disposition to study the past developments of humanity in the mood of sympathy rather than of alienation, and to distrust every judgment which has nothing genial in it to abate its scorn; and must keep his place among those harsh critics who, scrape as they may at the outside of error and evil, can never find its heart. Speaking to the supporters of a theological institution, I ask, what can any one make of the Nicene controversy and the whole growth of the Trinitarian doctrine, who takes it merely from the modern English point of view, and does not bring to it a mind steeped in that Hellenic philosophy for whose conceptions it endeavoured to find evangelic expression? or how, without an inner acquaintance with the scholastic realism, can any sense be extracted from the discussions respecting the Eucharist? Or, again, who can in the least appreciate the Pelagian struggle, and measure the grand figure of Augustine and his shadow stretched upon us still, that shrinks from the great argument of our moral nature, and esteems the discussion of Fate and Free-will the proper business only of revolted spirits?

Nay, did we even teach our young divines no history at all,—were we content to throw them, with only modern outfit, upon the world of to-day,—the case would scarcely be improved. Of one of them the lot is cast, we will suppose, in a district of manufacturing activity; and on the other side of the street to his little chapel stands the hall of local *Secularism*, where the doctrine of circumstances and the constitution of man are expounded, and the basis of Theism is disputed, and mild proposals are entertained for perfecting the State by superannuating the Church. Another, perhaps, is settled with a society where one or two of the most intelligent members, with habits of thought trained exclusively in the medical lecture-room or the engineers' college, have been reading Comte, and learned to look upon the pulpit as a mediæval relic. A third, in the walks of a London pastorate, finds himself among some generous youths, driven by the meaner aspects of competition, or inspired by Alton Locke, to grasp at Socialistic dreams. A fourth, placed on the Committee of a Mechanics' Institution, meets with associates afflicted with the Carlylian phrenitis, and given to strong declaiming on the subject of the "Jenseits" and the "personal God." A fifth finds a pleasant and thoughtful neighbour in the young Independent minister, who has found in Coleridge and Maurice a blessed emancipation from the rigours of dogma once oppressive, and images of terror once unrelieved. These, I need hardly insist, are not exceptional phenomena which it is arbitrary and far-fetched to imagine. They are the marking facts, the living characteristics, of our time,—the actual present out of which the morrow will be made. And with these aspects of belief and tendency no one is qualified to deal who is not supplied with some philosophic apparatus of thought, and has not faculties trained by a philosophical gymnastic. If the problems of the time are not to pass us by, if we are to share in the intellectual and moral enterprizes on which they are bound, the step must not be reluctant, and the energy must not be slow, with which we resolve to overtake their march. Theoretic studies stand, in our day, among the first of practical necessities. To lament the fact, is useless; to change it, is impossible; there is wisdom only in adopting it. The greatest adversary of "German mysticism" and German dialectic cannot distrust more thoroughly than I do the soundness, not only of the system which on the continent is ascendant for the hour, but of all the vast schemes for replacing *faith* in the "Absolute" by *knowledge* thereof; and it is with deliberate conviction that I profess adherence to the English psychological method, and build all my hope for philosophy on accurate self-knowledge. But this very position can no longer be quietly assumed and supposed to be in our possession; it has been lost by our want of vigilance, as compared with the intense activity of that foreign speculation which now invades us; and it must

be won back by a polemic resting on new points of support, and not ignorant of the dispositions with which it has to deal. The metaphysic foe, however barbarous and even pagan you may pronounce him, will not quit his entrenchments for ever so much scolding: you may have his camp if you will; but then you must go and take it; and for this end some equipment will be needful.

I trust that I have guarded myself sufficiently against any suspicion of one-sided vindication of my particular department. To preclude, however, the possibility of misapprehension, I would add that, if external and historical studies require philosophy for their interpreter and soul, philosophy no less requires them for its body and means of balance. It might seem at first as if, for self-knowledge, the mind would be its own sufficient company, and, shut up in its own communion, would learn the laws by which its faculties exist and act. It will be found, however, that only before the mirror of other minds can our nature truly see itself. By a rule of mutual dependence, we are wakened to self-consciousness by the life of others, whom again we rouse to inward discovery by our own. It is not only that we see in them new facts which enlarge our view of human nature as an object of outward observation, but they reveal us more profoundly to ourselves, by touching springs within us that had slept before; and of the whole compass of our being, the greater part remains latent and unexplored till the light of a kindred experience bursts into it and spreads throughout its depths. Without a large association with the different forms of thought and passion, especially without a studious communion with the genius and wisdom of ages other than our own, mere introspection would be but a barren thing, for there would be little in ourselves of that which it is worthiest to know. The more we mingle with the noble crowd of poets, historians, statesmen and philosophers, who, in various dialect and under contrasted civilizations, have uttered the enduring wants and sentiments of humanity, so much the more (provided always we admire and love before we criticise) does the circumference of our nature expand, and answer in its dimensions to the great world assigned us to understand. But the value of such learning is contingent on its really *coming home to you*, and finding out in you the very seats of feeling and conception from which it sprung; till it does this, and you are conscious that in knowing more of mankind you know more of yourself, it remains little else than an assortment of archæologic lumber, and makes you *heavier*, but not *larger*. The efficacy of all erudite attainment is not realized till it carries you to the *genesis* of the human phenomena with which it brings you into contact, and you apprehend them as the form and development of an inner life. The true principle of a perfect mental culture is perhaps this;—to preserve an accurate balance between the studies which carry the mind out of itself and those which recall it home

again,—between attention to matter given it, and reflection on its own processes and laws. The several departments of knowledge, prosecuted singly and exclusively, fulfil this condition in very different degrees. Speaking generally of the three great divisions, we may say, that the physical sciences violate it at the one extremity, by giving overwhelming preponderance to outward observation and induction of necessary laws; that theology and metaphysics violate it at the other extremity, by giving too much substance to the forms of inner thought and feeling, and encouraging the student to coerce nature into the arrangements of a speculative framework; while literary pursuits, engaging us as they do with men's affairs,—the human with the human,—occupy the middle place, and afford us objects, to know which is to lose a portion of our self-ignorance. And among these central studies, it is easy to see why *language* occupies the very focal place, and has been justly recognized as supplying the faculties with their most effective discipline. For here the equipoise between external attention and internal reflection is maintained more perfectly than is possible elsewhere. Who can say whether language is an outer or an inner fact? It is evidently both. As a realized object of sense, transmitted from point to point of space, and recorded from age to age of time, it is manifestly external, and spreads its relations visibly before the eye, and lies open, like any material product of physical nature, to the simultaneous notice of innumerable observers. On the other hand, as the mere passage of thought and feeling out of silence, the direct out-come of our intellectual and spiritual life, it is a primary function of the inner mind, the mere incarnation (so to speak) of our highest energy. Accordingly, it has no significance, it is not an object of study at all, except on the condition of self-knowledge; its distinctions, its classifications, its shades of relation, its forms of structure, are the very distinctions, and classifications, and relations, and architecture, of thought itself; and whoever engages himself with them, does but see his own intelligence externalized. Dealing with a fact of physical nature, you have to collect or guess its place and meaning in the system of things from its grouping or its look; but in handling the phenomena of language, you invert the proceeding, and carry into it from your own consciousness the idea that gives it shape; having the essence at home, you interpret by it the foreign form. I believe it is this necessary action and reaction of acute observation and thoughtful reflection, to which a philological discipline owes its peculiar advantage for training the faculties with less distortion than any other single pursuit. But the desired end is gained in a much higher degree by a plurality of studies; and especially, if an addition be made on the mathematical and physical side to the grammatical centre of gravity, is it important to annex on the other side the counterpoise of psychological and ethical philosophy. Even

in the teaching and management of each of these separate departments, much may be done to maintain the equilibrium of mental exercise; and as the historical studies of this place are conducted, I well know, with constant reference to philosophical truth, and penetrated with a profound philosophical insight,—so will it be my endeavour perpetually to check and test philosophical theory by regard to historical fact, and construct it less on the narrow base of egoistical reflection, than on the broad area presented by the recorded consciousness of mankind.

To the pursuits which I am appointed to represent, I can scarcely anticipate that the objection will *here* be made that is sometimes advanced against them, that they deal with problems which an express Revelation has settled; into which it was indeed inevitable that Reason should look, when no better guidance was at hand; but the further discussion of which is superseded for Christians. The objection, it is plain, even when limited to *Ethics*, mistakes the nature both of moral science and of revealed religion. Upon no theory that I ever heard of, is the thing revealed the same that our science wants to know; nor does Revelation, even upon its own ground, in any way interfere with the simultaneous aspirations of Philosophy. Whatever truths, whatever duties, are first opened to us by Christianity, are either authoritatively announced, or brought out by the silent and continuous operation of its spirit upon the soul. If they are simple oracular deliveries, they are presented without their grounds, and those grounds remain yet to seek; and though implicit obedience may be due and may be given in any case, whether we succeed or not, there is surely an additional consent, and (may we not say?) an additional beauty before the eye of God, in a service rendered no longer by a blind docility, but with brightened look and full power of the undivided and understanding soul. And if there be any provision in Christianity for the growing evolution of divine truth and human discernment, then does this very process constitute a new fact in the history and experience of humanity,—a fact whose law and whose moral traces it is the business of a reverential philosophy to follow. Indeed, Christianity, it is plain, does not come to us as to godless and irresponsible animals, but pre-supposes the faculties by which we attain to faith in God and a sense of duty, and addresses us as beings to whom sin and sorrow, prayer and trust, are not unknown. To justify these faiths which revelation assumes—to interpret this conscience to which it appeals—remain, therefore, in any case, offices in attempting which philosophy does not pass the forecourt of our religion. And even then, whatever we learn beyond this, is still, if it be truth, something having reality in the universe,—something that cannot, therefore, be without its trace and its manifold relation; and, once knowing it, we may expect to detect its look where else we had not suspected it, and

may hope, by its light, to read off the significance of the world and of our life more profoundly than before. To do this, is in exact accordance with the aim of moral research. In truth, the larger the universe of our faith, the more copious are the phenomena delivered to our philosophy. So that Christianity, far from contracting the compass of our science, rather expands it to its own sublime proportions.

COLERIDGE, BAXTER, AND TOLERATION.

SIR,

I READ with perfect astonishment in your last number the following extract from Coleridge :

“Baxter was the nearest to absolute toleration of all theologians. He proposed that all persons admitted as Church-members should be ready to declare that they desired what was prayed for in the Lord’s Prayer, believed what was declared in the Apostles’ Creed, and held themselves bound to obey what was enjoined by the Ten Commandments, and that all beyond should be free to each.”

Is it possible that Coleridge should not have known that the principle of religious liberty was carried much further by Lord Clarendon, in his *Essay against Multiplying Controversies*; by Jeremy Taylor, in his *Liberty of Prophesying*; by Chillingworth, and by Locke?

Baxter’s scheme would really exclude the most reflecting Christians of our own day,—namely, all who do not admit the Jewish sabbath to be binding on Christians. Whether a small sect called Sabbatarians still exists, I do not know; but the mass of the Christian world has departed from the Jewish sabbath by substituting the first day of the week for the seventh, for which substitution they have never shewn any lawful authority, and by relaxing to a very considerable extent the strictness of the Jewish sabbath.

L.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE GOSPELS.

SIR,

YOUR last No. contains a notice of Higginson’s “*Spirit of the Bible*” by S. S., initials which no educated and constant reader of the *Unitarian Magazine* can avoid interpreting rightly. He to whom they belong is both erudite and lucid as a Biblical critic. He says, however, that we must give up the last chapter of John’s Gospel. I do not suppose him to mean that the shewing of himself by Jesus to certain disciples at the Lake of Tiberias is an invention, but only that it is not from John’s pen or immediate dictation. *Some* of your readers, however, may injuriously mistake the meaning of S. S.; therefore I should like to see the following remarks on John xxi. reprinted in your next No.

“The authenticity of this whole chapter has been warmly questioned; but there is abundant reason to attribute it to the apostle. (See the argument well stated by Kuinoel.)”—*Carpenter’s Harmony of the Gospels*, 1st ed., p. 293, note.

“The account in this chapter was, in all probability, received from

John's own lips, and written down after his death by one of his disciples. There is no ground to question its credibility as a whole."—Neander's *Life of Christ*, Bohn's ed., 1852, p. 483.

"The simple and artless narrative * * * carries with it plain marks of authenticity and truth. Minute circumstances are mentioned which an impostor would have been careful to avoid, and which it would have occurred to no person to relate except an eye-witness."—Timothy Kenrick's *Exposition*, 2nd ed., p. 567.

"No human art could have added another chapter to that life. * * * That thrice-repeated question addressed to Peter, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?' how wonderfully is it in keeping with the character of Jesus, and with all that had gone before!"—Remarks on the Four Gospels, by W. H. Furness, 1837, p. 285.

T. J. READ.

Stockton-on-Tees, Feb. 7th, 1854.

WINTER SONG.

(FROM THE GERMAN OF KRUMMACHER.)

How retest thou in quiet sleep,
Beneath thy snowy garment deep,
Thou lovely Mother-land!
Where are the merry songs of spring—
The gleam of birds upon the wing—
The joyous summer band?
Cold, leafless, thou dost slumber now;
No lambkins pasture on thy brow;
Upon thy woodlands bare,
No sound of humming-bee is heard,
And silent is the little bird;
Yet even in sleep how fair!
Where those frail twigs and branches twine,
A thousand pearly dew-drops shine,
A thousand lights I see:
Who hath prepared thy rimy bed,
Thy feathery vesture who hath spread,
And thus adorned thee?
The Father over all in heaven
Thy beauteous winter dress hath woven;
He watches through the night.
Sweet land, thy peaceful slumber take,
That Father doth the weary wake
To newer strength and light.
The breath that steals from summer skies
Shall bid thee joyously arise—
Soon shalt thou leave thy lair;
That breath is floating earthward now,
Again shall life engird thy brow,
And flowers adorn thy hair!

S. F. M.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Christ the Ransom paid by the Father for Man's Redemption from Sin and Misery: a Discourse. By R. E. B. Maclellan. 2nd Thousand. 1853.

THIS discourse puts in the clearest possible light the basis of that scriptural metaphor, whether Jewish or Christian, which represents the great interpositions of God on behalf of mankind as effecting the redemption of the latter.

"The writers of the New Testament (it never can be too often repeated) were *Jews*; familiar from their infancy with the sacred books of their nation, and thus compelled, by the necessity of their birth and education, to employ the language of those books, alike in their oral addresses and in their written compositions. Hence the thoughtful student of the *Christian* Scriptures is continually forced to inquire,—when he encounters in them either difficult or peculiar words, phrases or expressions,—what was their precise signification as employed by the Hebrew Lawgivers [Lawgiver] and Prophets? The words 'ransomed,' 'bought,' 'purchased,' 'redeemed,' are in exactly this position; and to the pages of the *Old Covenant* we must consequently repair, if we would really arrive at their correct signification. Each of these terms was originally employed to denote the *liberation of a captive from a state of personal slavery*. By an easy and natural transition, they came next to denote deliverance from evil of *any* kind, whether physical or moral; and the deliverance itself was called a 'redemption,' and the means by which that deliverance was effected was styled a 'ransom.'

"In the Jewish Bible these words are generally employed to designate the rescue of the Israelites from their long and painful subjugation to the Pharaohs. Thus Isaiah, in his fifty-first chapter, at the tenth verse, evidently alluding to the wonderful manner in which Jehovah had parted the waters of the Red Sea, that his chosen people might escape from their pursuing enemies, exclaims—'Art thou not [He] which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the *ransomed* to pass over?' Referring also to the same great event, Jeremiah declares in ch. xxxi. 11—'Jehovah hath *redeemed* Jacob, and *ransomed* him from the hand of him that was stronger than he.' In the actual emancipation of a slave from the person who held him in thralldom and considered him his property, of course a sum of money, or other valuable equivalent, was bestowed. Even *this* incident also finds a place in the language which expressed the manumission of the whole Israelitish people; and in allusion to it the Most High is represented as saying, in Isaiah xliii. 3, 'I am Jehovah, thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour. I gave EGYPT *for thy ransom*, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.' Were it possible to understand any part of this language literally, the purchase-money or redemption-money ought to have been paid *to* Egypt, for it was she that held Israel in bondage; and if you wish to buy the freedom of a slave, it is of course to the *owner* of the slave that his price must be paid. Nothing, therefore, can be more clear, than that the prophet, in making Egypt not the *owner* but the *price*, was uttering language that was purely figurative and metaphorical."—Pp. 3, 4.

"In the literal transaction, very common in the East in ancient times, from which all these terms—'ransom,' 'bought,' 'purchased,' 'redeemed'—are so evidently and unquestionably borrowed, there were four persons or things,—the *owner* of the slave, the *slave* himself, the being who *emancipated* him, and the *price* he paid for his manumission. The king of Egypt was in the case before us the owner of the slaves; the Israelites were the slaves; Jehovah was the being who liberated them; but what was the purchase-money I cannot discover—in fact, there was nothing equivalent to a purchase-money; the

analogy fails therefore in this particular. It fails also in another, that they were not actually 'bought' at all from Pharaoh; they were, on the contrary, taken without his consent; taken by violence; and instead of receiving a valuable consideration for his goods and chattels, he met with nothing but chastisement and ruin. These expressions, therefore, cannot be understood in what is, at the first reading, their obvious and natural sense; and we are compelled to regard each and all of them as so many *figures of speech* to narrate the simple fact, that God delivered the descendants of the Patriarchs from 'the land of Egypt and the house of bondage.'—P. 5.

Having thus plainly shewn the figurative character of the language as applied to the Jewish people ransomed and redeemed from Egypt, and having further told us that "when the writers of the New Testament adopted this, the current language of the Old, we are bound to suppose that they employed it with the same latitude of signification,"—Mr. Maclellan, somewhat to our surprise and disappointment, spends the rest of the discourse in literalizing the language of the New Testament in reference to the Christian redemption, and shewing how mankind were the slaves of idolatry, moral darkness and the fear of death; how Christ was the purchase-money, and God the purchaser. All this is indeed, in a way, true; and there is a good passage (p. 6) on the old literal orthodox notion that God purchased men from Satan, their previous owner. But when we have already found, in analyzing the Jewish phraseology of ransom and redemption, that there is no such thing as a price or payment actually contemplated, though the figure of speech itself points to such a transaction as its origin,—why should we, when advancing a step further in the world's history, and finding the same figure reverently applied by Christian apostles to the salvation by Christ, literalize it down again to a meaning which it had lost in the days of Moses?

As an answer, indeed, to the absurd and irreverent orthodox theories which strain the language of Redemption into a theory of actual price and bargain on the part of Christ as purchaser from God as punisher, Mr. Maclellan's recurrence to the literal idea involved in the figure is fair and just. It is a decisive answer to such technical polemics, to say, "If you must make this out to be a transaction of buying and selling, then undoubtedly God is the merciful purchaser, and Christ the ransom paid; and man is the ransomed slave; and the grim slaveholder who exacts his price is the World, the Flesh or the Devil." But this is not scriptural doctrine; it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of orthodoxy. The scripture doctrine is *deliverance by the sovereign will of the Heavenly Father*. The ransom and the redemption are old terms, having their literal import in dim antiquity, and their established use in the celebration of God's compassion and free bounty. In this view, we cannot assent either to the doctrine or to the taste of that part of this discourse which represents the instructions of Christ, his conduct through life, and his death, as successive portions of the ransom paid by the Almighty to the powers of Idolatry and Evil. This is putting technicality against technicality; not erecting high truth in place of a technical error. The figure, in Christian hands, is not to be traced back to its original elements; for Judaism itself had left those behind. The Christian apostles take it up as already denoting the sovereign and free mercy of Jehovah; and how shall it mean less when they call him Heavenly Father? In short, we desire to see this *technical* argument limited to its proper place

as a mere exposure of the profaneness of technical orthodoxy, and the spirit of the doctrine of Redemption or Ransom illustrated from a higher and more truly scriptural point of view.

Free Thoughts on Natural and Revealed Religion, in reference to various Difficulties and objectionable Passages in the Old and New Testament; with Extracts from the Sacred Writings of the Hindoos, &c. By an Unlearned Inquirer after Truth. London—C. Fox. 1853.

OF the five Sections of which this little work is composed, the first contains remarks on Natural Religion, with evidence to its prevalence among the Egyptians, North American Indians, Hindoos, Chinese, Greeks and Romans. It indicates the universal prevalence of the idea of God, and adduces extracts to shew how just a groundwork of religion and morals may be found in the more distinguished writers and systems of the heathen.

Section ii. treats of "Scripture Doctrines commonly called Orthodox," and of their untenable nature. Some of the best Unitarian arguments and writers are adduced in proof. Too much difficulty and concession, we think, is generally made by Unitarians on the doctrine of Atonement; too great an anxiety is shewn to use the language and conciliate the regard of orthodoxy. We see traces of it in the references of this writer. At p. 32, there is a quotation from an early No. of the *Christian Teacher* (*Vol. xxxviii.* in the foot-note is, we presume, an error for *No.*), intimating the difficulties which embarrass the subject, and asserting that all the religions of antiquity are deeply imbued with the notion of vicarious sacrifices, and concluding, therefore, that the idea has some latent affinity with very deep wants and tendencies of the human soul. There are other things besides vicarious sacrifice which have extensively prevailed, and to which men have been prone, that Christianity decidedly opposes and seems to have been designed to correct. Instead, therefore, of supposing that Christianity necessarily inculcates it, we believe the presumption is that it does not, and that all difficulty, beyond misinterpretation of language, is founded upon the extent of the influence of prevalent human conceptions on the mind in the time of Christ, which we have not yet distinguished from the truth of God. The same consideration applies to the difficulty felt by the writer himself, and perhaps by many more, on conflicting views of the future life. We do not distinguish between the transient human form of it, viz., the resurrection of the body, the idea of which prevailed before Christian times, and the divine assurance in Christ's immortality overruling all human utterances and expectations among his disciples. We are alike concerned to observe a tendency among Unitarians to resume or perpetuate sacrificial ideas in connection with Christ's death, and their want either of knowledge or decision in respect of the true basis of the future life of man.

Section iii. treats of the general excellency of the Scriptures, with difficult and objectionable passages in the Old Testament. It opens with some of the most remarkable testimonies to the Bible by distinguished men, and proceeds with a series of the commonly urged objections,—as the story of creation; the language and properties of man ascribed to God; the sacrifice of Isaac; Jephtha's vow; commands of

cruelty ascribed to God; psalms of vengeance; that David was a man after God's own heart, &c. &c. What we have to observe upon it is, that with a clear and correct idea of what the Scriptures are, viz., not revelation, but records of what we so designate, and with due discrimination of the divine from the human element in the writers and actors, the difficulties disappear. Nothing could have been more welcome and appropriate than the publication of the Rev. E. Higginson's "*Spirit of the Bible*," as supplying the solution to difficulties which are here so honestly and reverently expressed. In that work, the writer, we think, will find satisfaction. One of the best descriptions of the Bible which the writer quotes is that by Burke:

"The Scripture is no one summary of doctrines regularly digested, in which a man could not mistake his way; it is a most venerable, but most multifarious collection of the records of the Divine economy; a collection of an infinite variety of cosmogony, theology, history, prophecy, psalmody, morality, apologue, allegory, legislation, ethics, carried through different books, by different authors, at different ages, for different ends and purposes."—P. 44.

In reference to a prevailing fear of incurring odium by the open avowal of difficulties such as the writer has expressed, he quotes a passage from the Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge (Sir James Stephen), which from its manliness and freedom we transcribe:

"No man is really free amongst us to avow his disbelief of the religion of his age and country; nay, hardly of any one of the commonly-received articles of it. With whatever seriousness, decorum and integrity of purpose, such an avowal may be made, he who makes it must sustain the full force of all those penalties, civil and social, which more or less attend upon all dissent from the received standard of orthodoxy. I acknowledge and lament that this is so. I think that they who inflict such penalties are entitled to no praise and to no gratitude. They give to disbelief a motive and an apology for a dishonest self-concealment. They give to the believing a painful mistrust that there may possibly be existing, and yet concealed, some potent reasons which, if men could speak their minds with real impunity, would be alleged against their own most cherished convictions. No infidel ever did or can do so much prejudice to our faith, as has been done by those zealous adherents of it who labour so strenuously, and so often with such unfortunate success, to terrify all objectors into silence."—P. 44.

Of Section iv., viz., difficult and perplexing parts of the New Testament, the same remark may be made as of Section iii. It is only to minds "called upon to receive the New Testament in the sense in which it is received by Christendom," unhappily, that many of the difficulties enumerated can occur. With a correct notion of what the books of the New Testament are, they cannot be entertained. In respect of others, it may be well to confess difficulty in order to obtain explanation; yet many of the objections specified in this section appear to us to be such as have been repeatedly removed, or are obviously and at once explicable by the character of Christ and the characteristics of the times. On the temptation and demoniacal possession, the author may be referred to Mr. Bretland's papers at the end of Vol. II. of his *Sermons*, or to Vols. V. and VI. of the *Monthly Repository*, where they first appeared, under the signature of Geron; also to a paper by K. in the *Christian Reformer*, Vol. V., New Series (1849), p. 321.

In respect of a few instances of miracle, of the application of prophecy,

of the language giving colour to the idea of eternal torments, of the features of some of the parables, of some of the language of Christ on various occasions, of the accounts of the resurrection, of the expectation that the end of the world was at hand, of certain ascertained interpolations of the New Testament, specific explanations occur in a variety of accessible works, and it is presumed elucidations of such subjects are habitually supplied from at least Unitarian pulpits. The great preventive of difficulty, however, we conceive to be, not to go to the New Testament with preconceived notions of what the writers or even characters of scripture ought to be, but simply to ascertain what they are, and what light they afford us. For ourselves, we can only say that, so approached, they give us the conviction of a real and self-evidencing history,—of a series of divine events, of which human beings in unusual action are the proof; and we need no more. Those events are to us the voice of God, a divine revelation, as we presume they were to them. To those events, therefore, we look, rather than to the opinions of those upon whom they first alighted. Their calling out high moral qualities and deep religious trust, is to us infinitely more.

With such views, the apparently conflicting texts or utterances placed in juxtaposition by the writer of *Free Thoughts*, &c., in his fifth and concluding Section, are easily explained. Minds variously influenced by events, whether special or ordinary, express themselves variously. Many of the texts thus contrasted can surely afford no difficulty but to minds in the most childish subjection to the letter, and probably are adduced only as examples of such weakness. One is a curious specimen of founding a difficulty on figurative language. Jesus, to impress his apostles with the impending calamity of his crucifixion, says to them, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one:" to this the writer contrasts the reproof of Peter—"Put up again thy sword; for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword;" as if they implied contradiction. This is to destroy the reality and grandeur of the occasion, and to interpret the utterances of a high-wrought frame of mind by abstract didactic sentiment. We can scarcely suppose Peter took the sword in so literal an obedience; though it is possible that, after the excitement of a similar occasion had gone by with time, much of his Master's wonderful language respecting the destruction of Jerusalem may have been too literally applied by himself and his fellow-apostles.

Some further difficulty as to the admission of Miracle and the nature of Inspiration is adduced, and the opinion of writers quoted. With ourselves, one consideration is sufficient. We have the undoubted history of men, of whom Paul is the most distinguished, acting under the influence of extraordinary events; and we have such a history of antecedent events as exactly accounts for the phenomenon, while the supposition of no other antecedents could do so. This is the philosophy of Supernaturalism in connection with Christianity; and, regarding it as unassailable, we are quite content to rest the rationale of Inspiration upon it. Divine events and combinations of events we conceive to have been the occasion of that. Some very just observations of Dr. Burnap's on this subject, from his *Discourses on the Rectitude of Human Nature*, bring this little volume of nearly 100 octavo pages towards its close,—observations which, the writer remarks, appear to him as, on the whole, satisfactory. He concludes justly that "the Bible may be said to contain

the word of God, rather than that it is the word of God, as infallibility cannot be shewn to be an endowment of the writers of it, nor, indeed, is it claimed by themselves."

The writer does not invariably supply the sources of his quotations. In respect of the anonymous one forming the last paragraph but one in the volume, we think there is the danger of the inference that all religions are equally favourable to morals. The whole book indicates a candid and serious mind. We may conclude that it expresses the thoughts of many hearts, the revelation of which in such a spirit is the sure precursor of difficulties removed.

Trinitarian Controversy in Manchester.

THE probably thoughtless shot discharged at Bristol by Canon Stowell has led to a very lively skirmish of the Unitarian and anti-Unitarian forces in Manchester. We have already mentioned the Canon Stowell's apologetic Letter to Mr. Budgett, and Mr. Gaskell's two Letters in reply. An anonymous "Clergyman" of the Puseyite school has taken the field. He bluntly tells the Canon that his remarks at Bristol were at least "very unseasonable," and that in making them he "infringed the laws of the Bible Society." He also intimates that, according to the Canon's line of argument, the Unitarian appears in the eyes of the world to as great an advantage as the Churchman, and that it would be uncharitable in the extreme for one to condemn the other. According to the Clergyman, the fault of Mr. Stowell is, that he has failed to appeal to the authority of the Church, which alone has power to settle theological disputes. Mr. Gaskell has reappeared in the field, and, as an appendix to a new edition of his Letters, has published a Postscript, in which, with admirable temper and wit, after playing off the Puseyite against his Evangelical opponent, he tears to pieces the boasted authority of the Church to settle controversial disputes. Our readers will find themselves abundantly rewarded by the perusal of Mr. Gaskell's Postscript, which is as lively and clever in style as we believe it to be sound and true in substance. The next missile was from the "orthodox" camp, and is a borrowed and very clumsy weapon, entitled, "The Unitarian Catechised." It is ascribed to Bishop Burgess, but might have been penned by any illiterate Methodist circuit preacher of three months' standing. It makes the Unitarian state that Christ was "a mere man," &c. The Unitarians replied in a very effective pamphlet, entitled, "The Trinitarian Catechised: a Dialogue between a Bible Christian and a Believer in the Trinity." This is written by some one well versed in the Trinitarian controversy. The Trinitarian, instead of being a mere man of straw, advances the arguments actually used in "orthodox" books, and is driven from one post to another, till at last he has only to choose between actual Tritheism or an entire abandonment of the doctrine of a Trinity. Not merely from the press, but also from the pulpit, is the controversy going on. At Cross-Street chapel, Mr. Robberds and Mr. Gaskell have been delivering a series of lectures on the great topics in dispute between Unitarian and "Orthodox" Christians, and they have been attended by very numerous and intelligent congregations. A Scotch divine, yclept M'Caw, who preaches in the Trinity Presbyterian church, Strangeways, has taken the field with a course of Sunday-evening lectures on "the Leading

Points of Distinction between Unitarianism and Evangelical Christianity." To him Dr. Beard replies in a course on the Doctrines of the Assembly's Catechism as contrasted with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Evangelical clergy are also marching into the field in considerable force. One course of lectures is announced during Lent, on the Thursday evenings, at St. Anne's church, by seven clergymen; and at Christchurch the Canon Stowell courageously undertakes to fight the battle single-handed, in a course of Sunday-evening lectures on "Distinctive Trinitarian Truths." "Persons who doubt or deny" what the Canon calls "vital truths," are "earnestly invited to come and lend a candid attention." In all this we greatly rejoice. The controversy now going on will, we feel assured, promote Christian truth. In the learning, ability and Christian temper of those who are vindicating Unitarian sentiments, we feel entire and grateful confidence.

The Congregational Year-Book, 1854; containing the Proceedings of the Congregational Union for 1853, and general Statistics of the Denomination. London—Jackson and Walford.

THIS annual continues to give evidence of the activity and success of the Independent denomination. It is edited with much industry and general accuracy. We regret that countenance is still given to the fiction of the *Three* Denominations. The absurdity of the statement is sufficiently refuted by the names which are given of the several denominations, the list being closed with those of the Presbyterian members of the body, which after eight years amount to just *three*, and we believe all Scotchmen. When the rotation of the Chairmanship shall fall to the lot of one of these gentlemen, should it be his duty to read an address at Court, Her Majesty, with her just accent and beautiful elocution, will somewhat wonder at the northern twang which her *English* Presbyterian subjects have contracted. The addresses delivered at the meetings of the Congregational Union by Mr. Alexander, of Norwich, as given in this volume, are very commonplace. Some of his hearers must have blushed for their Chairman when he uttered the calumny of a "Christless Socinianism" (p. 55). With equal justice we might talk of a *Godless Calvinism*. But, unless we are greatly mistaken, events are at hand which will shew our Independent brethren the prudence and necessity of theological candour and moderation.

The Hearth-Stone: Thoughts upon Home-Life in our Cities. By Samuel Osgood. 12mo. Pp. 250. New York, and London (16, Little Britain).

THIS volume supplies a want often felt by the parent and the friend—a series of essays on the various relations of domestic life, and the more important branches of home morals, which, while conceived in the spirit of religion, are treated with ease and refinement, and while kept free from the didactic form of pulpit orations, penetrate to the very heart of religion. Mr. Osgood's skilful and expressive pen gives fit utterances to the thoughts of an enlarged and cultivated mind. With much of the vivacity of Dewey and unctious of Gannett, he combines a wide familiarity with literature, and especially in its historical and biographical

departments. He does not lack the courage necessary to grapple with reigning and fashionable follies, and it is guided by a judgment admirably true. The "Hearth-Stone" to which Mr. Osgood conducts us with so much ease and grace, and to which he bids us welcome with almost prodigal intellectual hospitality, is at an *American* fireside; but the tastes, sentiments, principles and habits which he inculcates are not bounded by republican or local limits. Take away or modify some twenty or thirty pages in the book, and the whole may be read in reference to our English homes. There are eighteen essays, and their titles are—1. "Home Views of American Life," suggested by the beautiful American festival, borrowed from a Hebrew usage of "Thanksgiving-day;" 2. "The Ideal of Womanhood," composed on Christmas-eve; 3. "The Hope of Childhood;" 4. "New Things," adapted to the beginning of the year; 5. "Solicitude of Parents;" 6. "Reverence in Children;" 7. "Brothers and Sisters;" 8. "Marriage;" 9. "Our Friends;" 10. "Master and Servant;" 11. "The Divine Guest," a most beautiful May-day discourse on our Lord's visit to Zaccheus; 12. "The Orphan;" 13. "The Young Prodigal;" 14. "Education of Daughters;" 15. "Business and the Heart;" 16. "Summer in the Country;" 17. "Returning Home;" 18. "The Church in the House."

What little room we have for extracts shall be devoted to the essay on Marriage.

"God's will is clearly shewn in the effect of marriage upon the moral condition of the parties themselves. It is generally essential to their true life—to the proper development of their affections and faculties. Under good Providence, it is the school of the heart, the motive to the most laudable exertion and sacrifice. There are persons, indeed, whose peculiar duties may exempt them from its cares,—scholars, devotees, philanthropists, who may give their whole heart to their chosen speciality, and make of science, religion, or humanity, their family and home. Yet these are not the general rule, and even these generally prove that the peculiar power acquired by concentrating their whole mind upon a single pursuit, gives them force at the expense of breadth of culture, and may be morbid because preternatural. The monk and nun, in the convent or out of it, have done noble things, and every faithful memory must bless them for it—but not the noblest things. They have shewn much mercy, yet quite as much spiritual pride. If they have fed the poor, they have framed the Mass Book and the Confessional. If they have cared for the orphan, they have also invented infant damnation and the Inquisition, insisting on hell hereafter for all not baptized by their priesthood, and devising a hell here below for all heretics against their creed. Unmarried people ruled Christendom for a thousand years, and that they did not rule in wisdom, the Bible, history, and our best modern culture, all declare. Nay, the very sage of modern celibacy, Swedenborg, gave years of his life and the chief labours of his pen to prove, that the best wisdom comes from minds united conjugally, imbuing thought with affection, and informing affection with thought, and so best interpreting the God in Christ. They who may be puzzled by his mystical lore will have no difficulty with the more practical argument, or refuse to allow that the most healthy thought and feeling, the most comprehensive culture, frequents the home which a true marriage makes."—Pp. 123, 124.

Thus plainly, but wisely, does Mr. Osgood vindicate the importance of common sense in married life:

"Feeling of itself, even when healthy, is a poor guide, sadly blind without reason. Whether it go with love or indifference, folly carries misery into the home. The proverb is true enough—

‘A stone is heavy and the sand weighty,
But a fool’s wrath is heavier than both;’

and we might add, a fool’s love is quite as heavy as his wrath. We speak not of the folly which is a natural misfortune, but that of minds befooling themselves by levity, or dissipation, or idleness. Nothing wears better than good sense, and nothing is more essential to permanent congeniality and usefulness. It is sometimes a stern censor, but only because it wishes to be an honest friend. Let married persons take it for their counsellor, and it will settle for them many questions which inflame self-will and disturb love itself. They need above all others to be reasonable, to look to reason with all its revealed lights as the interpreter of God’s will to them, and of their own relation to each other. It is a great thing for them to start in life with reasonable views of the most commonplace arrangements of the household. How much disappointment, and bitterness, and sin, come from unreasonable views of expense; and who will undertake to estimate the amount of domestic misery resulting from household extravagance? The dress of many a wife, and the wine account of many a husband, has been the ruin of the family. Let every couple start with a fair understanding as to what they can afford to spend, and keep sacredly within the limit. If the world laughs at their simplicity, they can well afford to laugh at the world’s folly, and time will be very likely to put the laugh upon the right side. Much might be said of the deplorable influence of the extravagant notions of most young women in preventing thoughtful men from taking the risks of marriage, and we hazard nothing in saying that the worst vices of cities are closely connected with the growth of feminine extravagance. America will lose her birthright, and have no trace of the old domestic order, if the folly runs through the land; and most girls are brought up to exact more expense than the average returns of industry and talent can earn.”—Pp. 127—129.

Thus earnestly does Mr. Osgood contrast the mischievous and indolent spirit of compromise, which in some families eats away mutual respect and domestic happiness, with that resolute co-operation which is based on mutual understanding and affection:

“Is there not need of urging with some emphasis the worth of reasonable relations between husband and wife? Are they not too ready to make a compromise of follies—the one annoyed by having her tastes and habits reviewed in the strong light of a masculine understanding—the other irritated at having his hard worldliness criticised by feminine refinement or sensibility—the two sometimes settling the difficulty by non-interference—the one left to extravagance and frivolity, if she will consent not to insist upon having her husband’s time or thought—the other allowed to drudge as he will, if he will not intrude his utilitarianism into her sphere, or apply common sense to the charming follies that devour the dollars and the days? It is all wrong, and no gifts of fortune can make up for the want of thoroughly rational companionship between parties so allied, and so apt to belittle each other by triviality. Both are gainers by it, and intellectually as well as morally—the more gainers as in generous studies of nature, art, history, society, they take a common interest in the enlarging and ennobling fields of thought, and their habitual confidence makes them educators of each other. Without being alarmed by the valiant Minervas, who brandish their flashing spears from reform platforms, and declare an independence at which the old Revolutionary signers would have stood aghast, we believe that the most thorough practical discipline is to be found in this home school, and the enlargement of feminine perception and the refining of masculine vigor would advance vastly under such a culture. There would be a better mutual understanding of the two great domains of life, and a holy alliance between the two great families of minds. In plain language, if husband and wife would advise with each other fully on all important subjects, the robust understanding would be much

helped by the quick wit, and fewer foolish things, far fewer evil things, would be done in the world. In phrase more ideal, yet equally true, if insight were better allied with argument, ready sensibility with executive strength, nice perception with comprehensive judgment, reason would have a new avatar on earth, and the light of God would shine as never before in its beauty and its power into each household and over the great globe.”—Pp. 129, 130.

With one other beautiful passage from this admirable essay, we close our notice of the “Hearth-Stone:”

“It is a great thing for two frail natures to live as one for life-long. Two harps are not easily kept always in tune, and what shall we expect of two harps each of a thousand strings? What human will or wisdom cannot do, God can do, and His Providence is uniting ever more intimately those who devoutly try to do the work of life and enjoy its goods together. For them there is in store a respect and affection, a peace and power, all unknown in the hey-day of young romance. Experience intertwines their remembrances and hopes in stronger cords, and as they stand at the loom of time, one with the strong warp, the other with the finer woof, the hand of Providence weaves for them a tissue of unfading beauty and imperishable worth.”—P. 132.

We must postpone to a future No. a notice of another and more elaborate volume by Mr. Osgood, on the “Footprints of Providential Leaders.”

OBITUARY.

Jan. 12, in his 89th year, Rev. WM. PARR GRESWELL, sixty-two years perpetual curate of the chapelry of Denton and Haughton, in the parish of Manchester. His works had procured for him a respectable station in the department of typography. He was the literary associate and personal friend of Roscoe and Shepherd, and was characterized by the moderation of his opinions and the catholicity of his sentiments. He lived through a long life on a humble cure; and with the addition to his income, during some years, of a school, he was enabled to educate three sons at the University of Oxford, where they have succeeded in obtaining academic, ecclesiastical and literary reputation.

Notwithstanding his great age, his faculties, except that of sight, were clear to the close of his days.

The chapelry which he occupied was that held in the seventeenth century by John Angier, the father-in-law of Oliver Heywood. In the quaint and antique chapel of Denton (still remaining an interesting monument of the simple ecclesiastical style of that age), were laid the foundations of the Non-conformist interest, which has subsequently developed itself with considerable strength at both Dukinfield and Gee Cross. Mr. Greswell took great

interest in the early history of his chapelry, and had collected some rare books illustrative of it.

Jan. 18, aged 71 years, MARGARET, wife of Joseph Brooks YATES, Esq., of West Dingle, near Liverpool.

Jan. 22, Mr. RICHARD BARKER, of Nantwich.

Jan. 30, of consumption, JOHN GENT BROOKS, minister to the poor, in connection with the New Meeting-house, Birmingham. He was born at Hinckley in 1815. His parents, though upright, were so poor, that before he was eight years of age he was obliged to earn money at the stocking-weaving towards his own support. His constitution, naturally delicate, became more so from a sedentary life; yet so great was his thirst for knowledge, that he often deprived himself of proper food in order to procure books; and when quite a young man, he commenced a plan of mutual instruction, which laid the foundation for the Mechanics' Institution in his native place. When trade was extremely bad, he set the example of going into the workhouse for temporary support, rather than taxing the benevolence of private individuals; but being highly respected, he was at once

appointed schoolmaster there, and remunerated for his services. When political agitation was very great, and the discontent of the poor threatened to cause an outbreak, Mr. Brooks drew up a memorial, with a view to create a better understanding between work-people and their employers, which had the desired effect, and won for him the gratitude of all. He wrote several able articles in the *Morning Chronicle*, which shewed the comprehensive and impartial view he took of the state of society and its requirements. One of these was read by a gentleman of great benevolence, who took means to discover its author; and being struck with his peculiar power to influence others, gave him the privilege of pursuing his studies at the Training-school at Ealing, near London. About this time, Mr. Brooks was examined before a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the subject of Allotments of Land for the Labouring Poor, in the establishment of which system he had taken an active part, and was prepared to give all needful information respecting it. A lady of distinction combined her liberal assistance with that of the gentleman already above mentioned, and seeing his desire to become a minister to the poor, put it in his power to visit Mr. Johns, of Liverpool. The congregation at the New Meeting were at this time eager to secure the services of such an individual, and during nine years had reason to rejoice in his residence among them. Notwithstanding his feeble health, his exertions were almost unremitting. One plan of usefulness and improvement was added to another, till it became difficult to raise funds for the benevolent objects which

this ardent philanthropist contemplated. The vicious were reclaimed, the ignorant instructed, the desponding elevated, beyond the most sanguine expectations of the friends of the Mission. All who had derived benefits were invited to impart them, nor were the humblest instruments despised by which the work of human improvement could be carried on. While thus blessing others, a silent and steady but rapid progress was manifest in the minister himself. His private diary bears witness to the severe scrutiny he exercised over the inner life. His mental vision embraced more and more clearly the light of divine truth. His early prejudices in favour of orthodox opinions gradually yielded to a closer investigation of the Scriptures. He set forth in the clearest light the Unity of God, and he did not permit the sinner to look for pardon without sincere repentance. The chapel in Lawrence Street was purchased for his use, and many who had wholly neglected religion were seen there listening with eager attention to the voice of their beloved pastor, and joining with heartfelt devotion in his fervent prayer. In his home, as in the world, the light of piety shone forth. His presence cheered the heart of friendship—his sympathy attracted the confidence of all. He had been confined to his house only one week by increased difficulty of breathing, and was eager to return to his usual duties, not conscious of the fearful progress of his insidious disease, when suddenly, without time to bid adieu to his family circle, he was called from the labours of time to the blessedness of eternity.

MARRIAGES.

1854. Jan. 8, at the Unitarian chapel, Brighton, Mr. JEREMIAH HARBERT to Mrs. ANNE SAYERS. The united ages of the six persons present on the occasion—bridegroom, bride, man and maid, with the registrar and minister, the Rev. H. H. Piper—made up the number of 406 years.

Jan. 28, at South Place, Finsbury, by Rev. J. S. Gilbert, Mr. M. P. MANFIELD, of Northampton, to MARGARET, eldest daughter of Mr. J. MILNE, of the same town.

Feb. 2, at the Unitarian chapel, Strangeways, Manchester, by Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., RICHARD, eldest son of the late Mr.

Richard WEBB, to ELIZABETH EMMA, youngest daughter of the late Mr. Thomas GRUNDY, all of Manchester.

Feb. 2, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, Mr. WILLIAM LEWIS to Miss ELIZABETH DORES, both of Nottingham.

Feb. 11, at the Unitarian General Baptist chapel, Dover, Mr. E. RUTLEDGE, C.E., to FANNY, second daughter of W. BOYCE, of the Victoria Hotel, Dover.

Feb. 14, at the parish church, Frodsham, Cheshire, FRANCIS A. FROST, Jun., Esq., Ashton-under-Lyne, to MARY, only daughter of the late THOMAS STUBS, Esq., Warrington.